4109. h. 16
1-16.

A REPLY TO Mr. *Davisson*'s Defence OF HIS Protestant Minister's Mission.

By FRANCIS HOLLAND A. M.
Rector of *Sutton* in *Wilts.*

Imperitiam tuam nemo potest fortius Accusare, quam tu ipse, dum Scribis. Hieron.

LONDON:

Printed for *James Holland*, at the *Bible* and *Ball* in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. 1723.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A REPLY TO Mr. *Daviſſon*'s Defence OF HIS *Proteſtant Miniſter's Miſſion*, &c.

SIR,

YOUR Letter I receiv'd with great Satisfaction; but a Multitude of other Buſineſs, which I could not poſtpone, wou'd not ſuffer me to acknowledge it ſooner. I entirely joyn with you in Opinion, that it is neceſſary to detect *Ignorance and unfair Dealing*, leaſt they ſhould paſs for Truth and Knowledge, by *the Aſſurance and Solemnity* with which they appear; but the Burden is heavy, and the Road very unpleaſant. Nothing but a want of Good Nature, or Employment, will make a Man delight in finding Faults; Vermin only are pleaſed to dwell upon Sores: But as you very well ſay, the Intereſt of thoſe who ſerve Mankind in other Stations of Life, requires our Aſſiſtance here, and 'twou'd be ungrateful to deny them what they want, becauſe we can ſcarce think it worth the giving. I therefore come in to you entirely, and ask your Pardon that I have not anſwer'd your Demands before. As you very well know my great Reſpect for you, and may eaſily gueſs why I have not ſhew'd it in this Affair with more Diſpatch, I aſſure my ſelf of the ſame Place I always had in your Friendſhip; and for thoſe who ſhall give themſelves the Trouble of reading the following Pages, I hope the Delay will make them come to it with more Coolneſs and Impartiality. In order to ſhew the Imperfections of Mr.

D——'s Scheme and Defence, I propoſe Firſt, *To conſider the Nature of the Chriſtian Miniſtry.* Secondly, *The general Hiſtory of it;* and Thirdly, *To follow the Courſe of thoſe Objections which have been made againſt me.* But before I enter upon this Method, I deſire my Reader will expect no more from me than to ſpeak to the Queſtion. I have neither Leiſure nor Inclination to enter into the Under-plots. I have affirm'd, that *the Sermon was intended againſt me, That it was wonderfully admir'd,* &c. this is deny'd; all I ſhall anſwer is, that the World may believe whether they pleaſe, that the Party are the only Evidence I have, and, if they pleaſe, ſhall be my Judges too. Mr. *D.* accuſes me of *too much ſharpneſs*; I'm ſorry for it: And frequently inſinuates, that I have had Aſſiſtance; I ſhall readily own that I want it in many Things; that he is too ſtrong for any one Man to deal with; and return him my Thanks for this Objection. Poſſibly, my Helper might throw in ſome of that ill Nature which is charg'd upon me, and ſo my Adverſary has freed me from part of that Accuſation, which I deſpiſe and abhor. In ſhort, I intend to neglect all that Reflection, which ſome Perſons may think I deſerv'd, and occaſion'd by my own Roughneſs, and in as few Words as I can, to eſtabliſh thoſe Strictures I made in my Conſiderations.

The Nature of the Chriſtian Miniſtry, I'm apt to believe, has been greatly miſtaken by all Admirers of the popular Scheme. They generally ſuppoſe a Miniſter to be one who is to inſtruct them, or rather to try if he can pleaſe them with his Diſcourſe; one that is to prefer their Petitions to God, and acquaint him with their Wants and Deſires; a Perſon who is to negotiate all their Affairs; and therefore the moſt fitly conſtituted by thoſe who intruſt him. This Notion is not Scriptural; For throughout the ſacred Books, he is always ſpoken of as ſent, or commiſſion'd by God, to tell Men what he has done for them, what Advantages he intends them, and what he expects from them. He is God's Ambaſſador, his Miniſter, taken by him from among Men, for their Uſe in Things pertaining to God. He is to declare the Will and Purpoſe of God to us, nor has he any Thing to do on our Part which is Authoritative. As God ſtands in need of nothing from us, but is graciouſly diſpos'd to do every Thing for us, he has told us ſo by his Miniſter; he admits of no Stipulation, Contract, or Bargain whatſoever, but what is entirely of his own making. We have nothing to give, nothing that can merit, nothing that we cou'd know wou'd be accepted, unleſs God of his Infinite Mercy had reveal'd to us his

his Condeſcenſion in admitting our Service. In the Performance of this Service, we can neither add nor diminiſh; the Miniſter can do no more for us than God has order'd, nor can he do it otherwiſe than he has appointed. A Miniſter then is a peculiar Servant of God's, impower'd by him to teach Men their Duty, to promote among them the Kingdom of his Maſter, and to tranſact their Affairs with him, as he has been pleas'd to appoint. The Conſequence of this is, that he has no Authority in Things purely Spiritual from Men. For in Matters which God has promis'd, and which are, as it were, Conditions on his Part, he only cou'd Authorize; and in thoſe which we are to do, and which are, as it were, Conditions on our Part, he only has appointed. There is then nothing in the Nature of this Office, which gives any Reaſon to conclude that the Authority is from Men. But, *tho' the Authority be from God, the Conveyance may be, nay always has been, by Men; and, if ſo, why may not God have repos'd the Power of conveying it in the People, for whoſe Advantage it is intended.* He may, no doubt; but whether he has or not is the Queſtion? This I will Anſwer by the ſecond Thing I propos'd, a general Hiſtory of this Conveyance. There is no Occaſion to conſider the *Jewiſh* Miniſtry, the Deſignation there has always been confeſs'd Divine, and Independent of the People. Our Bleſſed Lord, call'd in Holy Scripture the *Great High Prieſt*, was ſent by God with Power to ſend others. The ſame Power which the Father gave the Son, the Son gave to thoſe ſent by him. This Power they exercis'd, and never at any time ask'd, or had the Conſent or Authority of the People in *conſtituting any ordinary Eccleſiaſtical Officer.* After the ſame manner their Succeſſors proceeded, ſending Miniſters as occaſion requir'd, by that Power which was committed to them Independent of the People. But as the miraculous Gifts by which ſome were ſignify'd to be fit for the great Office, and others enabled infallibly to diſcern it, fail'd, the Officers manag'd this Affair otherwiſe, and in different manners; ſometimes a Biſhop conſtituted another alone, ſometimes with three or more, ſometimes in a Council, ſometimes before the People for whom he was deſign'd, that ſo they might be acquainted with the Impediments, if there were any; and as far as lawfully they cou'd, might conſider the Affections of the People. And at laſt ſo general was that prudential and purely human Method of conſtituting a Miniſter before the People, and with their Approbation, that it paſt into a Cuſtom, became a ſtrict Part of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, and where wanting, was thought to invalidate

2

validate the Title to the Benefice, tho' not to affect the Orders. This good Conſtitution, through bad Uſe, became the Occaſion of Faction and Tumult, the Promotion of ambitious rather than worthy Perſons; and after ſome Time, when the Church grew great in the Temporals, and the People riotous in their Elections, the Civil Power to preſerve Peace, and poſſeſs themſelves of a Privilege ſo Valuable, took upon them the Election, Nomination, or Recommendation; the Eccleſiaſtical Officers ſtill being confeſs'd the undoubted Conſtitutors of a Miniſter alone; and ſome times (tho' not ſo often as might have been wiſh'd) rejecting the Perſons preſented to them.

3 I have ſaid all this without producing any Authorities for it, becauſe I ſhall have an Opportunity of doing that under my third Head, to which I now proceed. There I promis'd to follow the Courſe of thoſe Objections, which have been made againſt this Account. Now if I ſhall prove that they are all Miſrepreſentations, and when ſet in a proper Light, either foreign to the Point they are pretended to favour, or ſtrong Probabilities of that which they oppoſe, I preſume this Matter will be pretty well eſtabliſh'd. I hope my Reader will excuſe me in this Part of my Performance, if the Method be not ſo clear and eaſy as might have been contriv'd. I'm to have the Defender of Mr. *D*'s Sermon in my Eye all along, and muſt therefore take every Thing he offers in the Order he has lay'd it.

It is ſomething difficult to find out what he wou'd have; He ſays(*a*) *The Elders, if any, are to preſide and direct.* He indeed denies the ſole Independent Power in plain Terms to the Clergy, but he either does not ſay what Power they have, or whether any or none. *All they* (*b*) *have to do in this Affair, is to direct the People in their Choice, and to confirm the Election by Prayer and Impoſition of Hands.* But then this Confirmation of theirs is worth nothing; for (*c*) *the Perſons elected have as much Power before as after it*; and he plainly ſays that Conſecration is not neceſſary, or eſſential to a Biſhop. In the Sermon he affirms, that the *Clergy may Preſide and Direct*, but the *People muſt Chooſe and Conſtitute.* In the Reply he gives them (*d*) *Power to vote alſo.* In the Sermon, *The Confirmation by Prayer and Impoſition of Hands is indeed ſpoken of*; but both there and in the Reply it is only an *uſeleſs Ceremony*, that *confers no Power or Authority whatſoever.* He is not pleas'd that I

(*a*) Sermon, p. 14. and 40. (*b*) p. 40. (*c*) p. 14.
(*d*) Reply 1. 89, 90.

think

think he veſts all the Power in the *People alone*, but yet himſelf gives them all that *is Neceſſary and Eſſential*. Not to dwell upon theſe Perplexities any longer, whatever his Words may import, I'll take him in the moſt favourable Senſe I can, and only ſuppoſe him to affirm, *that the People have an abſolute, eſſential Right of Electing their own Paſtors.*

Before I proceed to conſider what he has urg'd in ſupport of it; I muſt take Notice of two Reflections made by him upon my Obſervations on his Text; (1.) He ſays, *I don't diſtinguiſh between a dubious and poſitive Sentence, and that his Elegant Criticiſm upon* Archippus *was only Suppoſition.* It is true, p. 9 of his Sermon, Edition the Firſt, it is only Suppoſition; but p. 11, he is become ſo certain of it, that he makes an Inference from it, what Men of Senſe never allow to be done in dubious Caſes. Again Mr. *D.* was ſo ſenſible that this piece of Learning wou'd do him no Service, that in the ſecond Edition (which was made when the Country was clogg'd with the firſt) he prudently omitted it in both Places. It is a pity he ſhou'd have reſolv'd to defend what he himſelf did not approve. (2.) I blame him for Stigmatizing *Archippus*, and concluding that he then wanted *Admonition, as being actually Criminal.* His Anſwer is, that tho' Admonition does not ſuppoſe Guilt, *it was enough for him that* Archippus *was liable to what* he was warn'd againſt, *if not actually guilty.* So then Mr. *D.* affirms, that you may ſay all the Evil you pleaſe of any Perſon, tho' he has not committed it, becauſe he is liable to it. I'm ſure Biſhop *Davenant* does not concur with our Author in this Sentiment. I gave ſome Reaſons for believing the contrary Character might belong to *Archippus*; but tho' I ſhou'd grant that they are of no Weight, the Judgment of Charity wou'd make a Man ſpeak well of an Apoſtolical Perſon, if nothing appear'd directly againſt him. (p. 7) I ſay, ſuppoſe him guilty, and the Words of the Text to imply a Cenſure, and the Church to have the Power of Cenſure; how does it appear that the People had the Power to Cenſure? Mr. *D.* ſhou'd have prov'd the People to have been the Church, and then we ſhould have yielded this Point. Now we have not one Word to this Purpoſe, nor is any Notice taken of it. In Order to ſhew that very probably Cenſures were inflicted by the Miniſters, I invited Mr. *D.* to a View of the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and deſir'd him to conſider what full Powers the Apoſtle gave them. To this he anſwers, that theſe Powers were not Independent of the People, and that *they and their Powers are therefore not mention'd here, becauſe that Matter was ſufficiently eſtabliſh'd before.*

fore. I desire to know where? (2.) The Case of *Timothy* and *Titus* are no Rule to us, *they were Evangelists, not fix'd Bishops. They are never call'd Bishops in Scripture, nor can the Considerer, prove it: They had Powers which are given or enjoy'd now.* It Matters not what Names and Titles they had, it is certain they were Eccleſiaſtical Officers; and the Queſtion betwixt us is, whether Eccleſiaſticks alone have the Power of Cenſure, *&c.* which I have therefore affirm'd, becauſe I find St. *Paul* ordering it in the Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus.* Nor is it material that they were Evangeliſts (ſuppoſing that to be a Name for a diſtinct Officer) and not fix'd Governours; becauſe it can't be ſuppos'd that an Aſſiſtant ſhou'd have that Power which a ſole Governour has not; or an itinerant Preacher a Juriſdiction, when a ſettled Miniſter has none. Farther, Mr. *D.* ought not only to have prov'd that they were extraordinary Officers, but alſo that they were only extraordinary, and that the Powers of Cenſure, *&c.* were the very extraordinary Powers committed to them, a Thing never attempted nor ever to be perform'd. Mr. *D.* is witty upon my ſaying St. *Paul* writes in the Style of a Governour, or Monarch. *He only Command's in the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Will the Monarch of* France *Command in the Name of the Czar of of* Muſcovy? The Monarch of any Nation may and ought to Command, Exhort, and Beſeech in the Name of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and if he does ſo, will be no leſs glorious a Prince, and a much better Man. But is the Authority of *Jeſus Chriſt* over his Church no more, when compar'd with the Authority of a Miniſter, than that of Coordinate Princes? At this rate there is neither Regal nor Sacerdotal Authority upon Earth; for whatever the King, or the Prieſt does is all in the Name *i. e.* under the Authority of Chriſt. *But we are Ambaſſadors, therefore not Monarchs.* Monarchs are the Ambaſſadors of God, and his Chriſt. The old Heathen Poets, Hiſtorians and Philoſophers learnt from Nature to call them ſo; and a Man who had never ſeen one of theſe *odd Books*, might have read in his Bible, that they are the Servants of God. *Do Monarchs uſe to beſeech and entreat after this manner?* Our Author's Knowledge in Law and Politicks was much like his Skill in Divinity. He juſt now told us that the Difference between Chriſt and Church Governors is the ſame, as betwixt the King of *France* and the Czar of *Muſcovy*; and now he diſcovers that he has never ſeen ſo much of Laws, as to obſerve them ſometimes in a Style imperious, ſometimes ſupplicatory and endearing. In the cloſe of this Argument the Reader will find ſome inſipid Buffoonry:

Buffoonry: I take this Opportunity of telling my Reader, that I intend hereafter no Anſwer to any ſuch Matters. The ground of it is a Miſtake; for the Government of the Church by all but Papiſts has always been held to be *Ariſtocratical.* Sure if the Man had not been full of Witt indeed he cou'd never have run over at this rate.

We come now to the main Point. *He had ſaid that a Company of Saints —— joyn'd together by free and mutual Covenant to promote the Glory of God, have ſufficient Authority from Chriſt, to chooſe and conſtitute their own Miniſters.* Mr. D. is offended with me ſomewhere, for leaving out the Word [alone] and pretends he no where denies but that Miniſters have ſome Power in the Conſtitution of others. There he ſays, *that the Company of Saints have ſufficient Authority.* This with me, is the ſame as to ſay they have the Authority alone, for otherwiſe how is it ſufficient? And if they alone have it, what Power have the Miniſters? If we were to expect Exactneſs any where, ſure in the formal Stating the Queſtion; but if we have his Sentiment here; we have not one Argument or Authority for it in the Remainder of his Book. A ſort of wild Chriſtians, in a State of Nature, Baptiz'd, Inſtructed, and truly influenc'd to promote God's Glory and their own Advantage, without any Miniſters; or at Liberty to leave their good Inſtructers, and by Virtue of a freſh Covenant of their own making, procuring to themſelves Powers from Chriſt, have a ſufficient Authority, *&c.* This he affirms is *Rational*, that is, *is clear from Reaſon.* Now I aſſerted it was not clear from Reaſon, and that becauſe it never cou'd be clear from Reaſon, that God wou'd enter into Covenant with Men; and therefore it cou'd not be clear from Reaſon, that there ſhou'd be Miniſters of this Covenant. (2.) As it was a Covenant of Grace and Favour on the one ſide, and no Uſe or Advantage on the other, it cou'd never be clear from Reaſon, That they who in this Covenant were to be the only Gainers, ſhou'd have the Power of conſtituting the Miniſters of it. Reaſon encourages no Man to believe he ſhall receive, where he has no Grounds to expect. Reaſon always leaves it in the Power of a Benefactor to do his Favours, as he pleaſes. This is the Subſtance of what I obſerv'd: To which he Anſwers, *it may be Rational tho' reveal'd:* Who denies this? But can it at the ſame time be clear from the Light of Nature, and yet not at all diſcoverable by it. Can it be rational as that Word is us'd in Contradiſtinction to what is reveal'd? The ſame way of quibbling we find in the next Words; And Mr. D. plainly owns *that as it was*

reveal'd it ſtood alſo to Reaſon, in the Nature of the Thing (a ſtrange Uſe of Words) now what is this more than thoſe Words of mine, that it is only Rational, ſo far as it is Rational to believe and obey what God has reveal'd? That is, that it has not any Foundation in the Light of Nature it ſelf, or immediately.

Mr. D. has affirm'd that it is Rational the People ſhou'd chooſe, becauſe it tends to *Edification*. He allows that it is alſo *Rational* that they ſhou'd ſubmit to a *Miniſtry of God's Appointment*, very well; then it is Rational that the People ſhou'd chooſe, and alſo Rational that they ſhou'd ſubmit tho' they don't chooſe, both are Rational. All that remains then is, how the Fact ſtands, for it ſeems there is no other Difference as to the rationality. He might then have ſpar'd his Notions (which are utterly falſe in this Caſe) of a Voluntary Society, of Power and Authority deriv'd from the Society (not from God by the Society) with much more of the ſame kind; but I ſhall omit the inſiſting upon them becauſe, at laſt our Author gets out of his Labyrinth, and comes to the Point, an Attempt to prove that the People muſt chooſe from the Holy Scriptures. Mr. D. ſays he has ſhew'd that *Chriſt has given the Faithful (all of them) a Liberty of chooſing their own Officers from the Evangeliſts* Luke *and* John, *and that I have found Fault with him for omitting the other two Evangeliſts.* The Reaſon of this Omiſſion he pretends, is this, that the two latter ſpeak only of the *Power of preaching the Goſpel, but the other two of the Power of the Keys, and that he avoided the confounding of theſe Powers, as I have done.* The Confidence of this Anſwer wou'd make one ſuſpect it true, but it is far from it. For the ſame Hiſtory is reported in the Places referr'd to in all the four Evangeliſts, and what is by ſome call'd Preaching the Goſpel, Baptizing and Teaching, is by others call'd Remitting and Retaining. The ſame Power is given in all the Places, it is given to the ſame Perſons; and the ſame Aſſiſtances are promis'd in the Exerciſe of it. But if this Diſtinction ſhou'd be admitted, Mr. D. wou'd be a great looſer by it, and there wou'd appear the ſame Reaſon for omitting the Authority of St. *Luke*, as he pretended before for St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*. For he introduces our Lord ſaying, not one Word, of any Thing but Preaching in Teſtimony of what he had done, and promiſing the Holy Spirit to aſſiſt in it.

As for the xvi *Ch.* of St. *Matth.* v. 19. Mr. D. tells us, *the Grant there made of the Keys was not to* Peter *perſonally, but to* Peter *as repreſenting the whole Body of the Diſciples.* This Aſſ-

ertion

ertion is built upon a falſe Fact, and a Parcel of ſimple Reaſons. The Fact Mr. D. will not allow to be falſe, and perſiſts in it, that the Queſtion, [who do Men ſay that I, the Son of Man, am] *was ask'd of all the Diſciples, not the Apoſtles only.* What I deſcribe (according to him) *as one Action was not ſo, for the Miracle of the Loaves was a long Time after the ſending the Twelve, and the Queſtion ak'd a long Time after the Miracle.* Further, *he ſays that the Diſciples in general, not the Twelve only miniſter'd to the Multitude.* According to St. *Matthew*, our Lord ſent away the Multitude, took Ship and came into the Coaſts of *Magdala* (Ch. xv. v. 39.) and when the Diſciples were come to the other ſide (Ch. xvi. v. 5, *&c.*) they had forgot to take Bread. Upon the Solicitude this Neglect gave them, he upbraids them with forgetting the late Miracle. From thence he went into the Coaſts of *Cæſarea Philippi*, where he ask'd this Queſtion of the ſame Perſons who miniſter'd to the Multitude, who paſs'd over the Sea, who forgot to take Bread, and who were alone with him. Theſe according to St *Matthew*, are call'd the Diſciples (Ch. xv. and xvi.) and according to St. *Luke*, ſometimes the Diſciples, ſometimes the Twelve, never any Intimation of a larger Number. Therefore tho' theſe Actions were not at one and the ſame Time, they were continu'd and ſucceſſive. The Feeding the Multitude juſt before their paſſing over the Sea; the Expoſtulation about the Apoſtle's Infidelity or Forgetfullneſs, as ſoon as they were come to the other ſide, and the Famous Queſtion, as ſoon as they came to *Cæſarea Philippi*, which was not near a Days Journey. A long Time indeed: But then ſays he, that the Twelve alone were admitted in his Retirements is falſe, I own it. But *Retirement* was what I wrote, and this particular Retirement I have been ſpeaking of, was what I mean't. If then the plain Words of the Goſpel, and the natural Senſe of them ought to be as Satisfactory as the Fancies of Mr. W. and Mr. D. the Caſe muſt be determin'd on my ſide. It is ſaid, *when the Twelve, or the Eleven are ſpoken of, they are generally diſtinguiſh'd by thoſe Names; but where Diſciples are mention'd, the Diſciples in general are intended.* Let us try this Rule, St. *Luke* ſays, (Ch. ix. v. 12.) And when the Day began to wear away, then came the Twelve, and ſaid unto him, ſend the Multitude away, *&c.* St. *Matthew* ſays. (Ch. xiv. v. 15.) And when it was Evening his Diſciples came to him ſaying, *&c.* So exact are Mr. D's Criticiſms!

Thus the Fact alledg'd being falſe, the Second, Third, and Fourth Reaſons fall with it. The Fifth however, is

Impregnable, and urg'd with uncommon Inſolence, but I can excuſe it. The Subſtance of it is this: *The ſame grant of Binding and Looſing is made to the Church in the ſame Terms and Latitude, as to the Diſciples, or the Twelve* Mat. xviii. 17, 18. But who are here mean't by the Church? Grant Mr. D. what he wou'd have, that the Chriſtian Church is intended; what is to be underſtood by the Church? Now thoſe who are call'd the Church v. 17. are the Twelve, as St. *Mark* informs us Ch. ix. v. 35. I think then I have the Authority of an Evangeliſt, for ſaying that by Church is here mean't the Rulers of the Church. Here again then the Fact is falſe, and conſequently the Reaſoning upon it. Beſides obſerve our Author's Reaſoning. The Queſtion between him and me is not, whether the Church has ſuch Powers, but in what Hands they are plac'd. He ſays in the Faithful People for that is the Church, which is the very Thing he ſhou'd have prov'd, but thinks fit to beg, the eaſieſt and the only Way of obtaining it. Not to perſue this Matter further, the Senſe of this Text has been given in ſo many Lights, by very Learned Men, that it is too dubious to argue upon, tho' our Author affirms it needs no Comment. He offers a Reaſon, which we muſt not Neglect, why the Church here, muſt mean all the Faithful. Again I ſay unto you, if two of you ſhall agree, *&c. What ſhall no Prayers be anſwer'd but thoſe of the Apoſtles?* I anſwer there is no Connection between this and the former Verſes, in the former he ſpeaks of Offences, and an Authority to redreſs them. In this of that Succeſs, he wou'd give to Unanimous Prayers. Both are directed to private Chriſtians; only in the former, they are directed to a proper Power for relief, in Caſe a private Correption will not prevail. If the latter Paſſage underſtood of the Apoſtles, implies an Abſurdity. it muſt not be underſtood of them. But if the former does not imply an Abſurdity (as Mr. D. has confeſs'd) it may ſtill be underſtood, as I wou'd have it Thus the Concluſions from theſe Words have no Foundation, and the Ridiculous Paraphraſe falls with them. But then, if the Power of Binding and Looſing belongs to the Apoſtles only, as Apoſtles, it died with them. Yes with with all my Heart; but whoever affirm'd that it belong'd to the Apoſtles only as Apoſtles; or is it a Conſequence that if the Church in this Place means the Apoſtles, that it was only to laſt their Time?

We proceed now from the Conſideration of the Charter to the Subſequent Practice upon it. Mr. D. affirms that this Binding and Looſing was exercis'd by the Church in

the

the Apoſtles Days, and that by their Direction, and for this he produces ſeveral Inſtances, But (1.) He takes that for granted which he ought to have prov'd; that Church muſt ſignify the Faithful People only, and that theſe Parts of the Epiſtles, which he cites, belong to the whole Body. For if Church may ſignify Church Government, why does it not ſignify that in the Caſe before us; and if an Epiſtle written to the Church of *Rome*, *Corinth*, &c. and ſent to the Governours, contains in it many Things which belong to the whole Body, many which belong to particular Orders, Ranks, Relations and Perſons; why muſt it be taken for granted that ſuch a Part of it belongs to the whole, when there appears no Neceſſity for it? (2.) I Anſwer as I did before, that it does not appear theſe were Cenſures cited by Mr. D. and that the Apoſtle does by no means ſet himſelf upon the level with the Brethren, but commands them to do So and So. Mr. D. does not *underſtand this Conſequence.* It is this then; that tho' the Paſſages intended Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure, that St. *Paul* dictates it to the Church, nay paſſes it upon the Criminal himſelf. *Have no Communion with him we Command you, Brethren &c.* (3.) ſuppoſing our Apoſtles Senſe to be what Mr. D. wou'd have it, how does it appear that the Paſſages abovemention'd were directed to the whole People? *Becauſe they are Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, and conſequently Cenſures of the Church.* Civil Cenſures are Cenſures of the Nation, and yet, neither inflicted by the whole Nation, nor by ſelect Perſons appointed by the whole Nation, For all that appears then, there may be Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures inflicted by the Eccleſiaſtical Guides only, and thoſe too not conſtituted by the People. *I'm often twitted with thinking otherwiſe than greater Men have done.* I'm well pleas'd with as low a Seat as any Man will give me, but ſuch Uſage ſhows a great want of Candour and good Manners. Let my Arguments be conſider'd and confuted, not bore down by Authority. I ſhall preſume to ſay that both Dr. *Whitby* and Mr. D. are miſtaken here: Mr. D. in thinking the Dr. miſtaken, when he aſſerts that at the writing thoſe Epiſtles, there were *ſcarce any ordinary* fixt Officers then plac'd in the Churches. For the Words of *Clement*, don't ſay they were fixt, tho' conſtituted; and at another Time Mr. D. can remember the Work of an Evangeliſt, and the perambulatory State of the Miniſtry. Dr. W. is alſo wrong in ſaying there were *no ſuch* Church Governours ſettled in the Church, and therefore that theſe Cenſures (tho' the Dr. is equally inclin'd to believe them Exhortations only, or at leaſt ſomething doubtful about it) were directed to all the

Brethren.

Brethren. For (Ch. v. v. 12, and 13.) of the former Epiſtle to the *Theſſ.* are theſe Words. *We beſeech you Brethren to Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you* Laſtly, they both err in ſaying that by the Church the whole Body muſt be intended.

We come now to the Inceſtuous *Corinthian*, a Caſe Mr. D. ſtill ventures to inſiſt upon as wholly on his ſide I gave a Reaſon why this Cenſure was the Perſonal Act of St. *Paul*, from v. 3. of Ch. v. Ep. 1. and from v. 10. of Ch. 2. Ep 2. Mr. D. ſays that in the former, the Apoſtle *directs the Church what to do*; but to the latter which is a Relaxation of the Sentence, he ſays nothing. Whoever will be at the Pains to conſider this Matter, will find him entirely wrong. St. *Paul* ſays. *Ye are puff'd up, and have not rather mourn'd, that he who hath done this Deed might be taken away from you.* He ſpeaks of them as *Suppliants and paſſive* (ἵνα ἐξαρθῇ) not one Word like Authority. But of himſelf he ſays *I verily, tho' abſent in Body yet preſent in Spirit, have judg'd* (Mr. D. tranſlates κέκρικα directed) already, as tho' I was preſent, concerning him that hath ſo done: *In the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, (when you are aſſembled together,) and my Spirit with the Power of our Lord* &c. Ep. the 2. *He excuſes* his not coming to them, as not proceeding from *Lightneſs but Lenity*; and ſays that he determin'd not to come again to them with Heavineſs. *For if I make you ſorry who is he then that maketh me glad; but the ſame that is made ſorry by me*, &c. 3 *To this End alſo did I write, that I might know the Proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all Things. To whom ye forgive any Thing, I forgive alſo: For if I forgave any Thing, to whom I forgave it, for your ſakes fargave I it* in the PERSON of Chriſt. Again he threatens them Chap. 13. of Ep. 2. and in the End of the former ch. ſuggeſts his fear that he ſhou'd not *find them ſuch as he wou'd, and therefore ſhou'd be found of them ſuch as they wou'd not.* I appeal now to any Man, whether the Apoſtle, in this Cenſure, Relaxation, Caution and Admonition ſpeaks of himſelf, or all the Faithful. But Mr. *D.* wants to know who were gather'd together. It ſignifies nothing: For (1.) the Authority was the Apoſtle's, not their's, (2.) it is expedient to call an Aſſembly, in order to make a publick Example, tho' not two of an Hundred had any Authority at all in it. (3.) ſuppoſing the Cenſure not inflicted by St. *Paul*, Mr. *D.* will never be able to prove, it was not inflicted by the Authority of the Clergy alone: As for the Paraphraſes of Dr. *Whitby* and Mr. *Lock*, I ſee not what ſervice they are to Mr. *D*'s Cauſe; but

beſides

beſides, they are really faulty, and don't carry in them the Emphaſis of the Original. I'll preſume to give the Reader mine, and leave him to his own good Senſe, to judge whether it is natural. *I've heard a Report of you, that you're Some of you, guilty of Fornication, and that ſuch, as even the Heathens abhor; I ſhall, therefore come to you with a Rod, as a Father to diſobedient Children. In the mean time, tho' your Condition is ſuch, you are puff'd up with Thoughts of the flouriſhing State of your Church, and have not with Sorrow and Supplication, ſolicited the removal of this Scandal. But I verily tho' abſent in Body, yet preſent in my ſpiritual Authority over you have determin'd, as tho' preſent in Body' to deliver ſuch an one, in your Eccleſiaſtical Aſſembly, by my ſpiritnal Authority received from the Lord Jeſus to Satan, for the mortifying his Fleſh* &c. *This This Sentence do you, in my abſence, execute.* Again, Ep. 2. Ch. 2. v. 6. *&c. As you were before, too remiſs in ſoliciting a Cenſure, ſo now you appear to me, too rigid in not procuring a Relaxation of it. Lay aſide your Severity, comfort the Perſon leaſt he be ſwallow'd up with Grief: I beſeech you be reconcil'd to him. I order'd you to inflict my Cenſure, that I might know whether you wou'd be obedient to me in all Things. But now I tell you, to whom you think fit, ~~to~~ ſee the Teſtimonies of their Penitence, to forgive any Thing, I readily relax their Sentence, having no private Ends of my own. For If I have forgiven any Thing, to whom I forgave it it was purely for your ſakes, and for your good, that I forgave, it, by the Authority delegated to me from Chriſt.* If it ſhall now be urg'd, that admitting all I have ſaid, this is a ſpecial Caſe, and relates to the extraordinary Authority of the Apoſtle, not to that of any ſucceeding Ruler of the Chriſtian Church (which is the Exception he makes to the Caſe of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*) all the Anſwer, ſuch an Exception deſerves, is to be call'd mere trifling. It lies againſt all Scripture Practice; and ſo much of Antiquity as was within the Times of Miracles and extraordinary Gifts; the pureſt and moſt early Days, at leaſt down to the Times of St. *John*, who is well known to have exerciſ'd and approv'd this Latitude in the miniſterial Office in many Parts of the World, without any ſuch Caution, or Limitation, long after the Accounts we have in canonical Scripture, Our Author's windings, in this particular, are very remarkable. If any Thing looks plauſible on his ſide, then for the Scriptural Pattern; but if any Thing is againſt him, have a care of making precedents of extraordinary Caſes: Beſides, there is another remarkable Defect in this Objection: He never attempt's to prove the Caſe extraordinary, but depends upon the courteſy of his Reader.

We

We now follow him through his maze of Antiquity. But before he enters upon it, he desires his Reader will believe me to be a very warm Man, *a despiser of the Laity, an opposer of private Judgment in any Degree*, whatsoever I may say to the contrary. These Suggestions are scarce worth my Notice. I'll venture to say, no Man will agree with him that knows me; and I hope no Man (for his own sake) will Censure me, that does not. He is gone to answer before a Judge he ca'nt deceive or impose upon; and I shou'd be glad to think he heartily repented of these Slanders. All sober Men, I'm persuaded, the greatest Enemies the Clergy have, are of my Opinion that the Multitude is very unfit for Government; and that most of those, who have had to do with them, lament their Weakness and Levity; and this is all which made Mr. *D.* so angry. Again, Mr. *D.* is displeas'd with me that I left out the Word [only] *and says he never pretended the Power in the People, exclusive of the Clergy.* How loosely he has spoken in this particular; the Reader may see in what is cited from him in the beginning of these Pages, and also in the very Place before us; but he shall mend what ever he pleases, and be alow'd to say, that the People have not the whole Power of constituting Ministers, *&c*, but only an essential Share of it, so that it can't be done without them.

The first Authority, taken from St. *Cyprian*, I asserted was borrow'd from the Constitution, Discipline and Unity of the primitive Church; and Mr. *D.* has no where told us in what Edition it is. This, he says, is a *false Accusation of that Author.* I own it; but it is a true one of him, for whom it was intended *i. e.* Mr. *D. He endeavours to silence me with great Names.* The worthy Person, he ascribes that Book to, never told the World it was his, and therefore in Civility, Mr. *D.* shou'd have forbore. Perhaps he might desire his Name shou'd not be known, that his Book might have no more Admirers than the Reason of it deserv'd; or, he might not have so good an Opinion of it himself (a Thing commonly reported whether true or false) as Mr. *D.* Be that Matter as it will, his good Sense and great Learning are every where commended, he stood in no need of Mr. *D*'s Panegyrick. He is as remarkable for his good Nature, as any of the valuable Talents he possesses, and can bear to be told, not only that he is fallible, but also that he has actually err'd. He has known, by Experience, that Men in low Stations, may some-

times

times discover the slips of those above them; and that they are not always in the right, who have a long Time seem'd to be so. I admire his Excellencies, and have I believe, been much better acquainted with them than ever Mr. *D.* was; nor do I think him more remarkable for any Part of his Character, than that he spakes his own Mind with clearness and ease, and hears himself oppos'd with Temper and Decency. *I've charg'd the Author of this Book with Translating this Passage false, but have not shewn where his Error is*: This is a Mistake, for I printed the Word in a different Character — *I extort a Grant.* This implies Power, but he, in asking their Consent, never intended that; this Temper inclin'd him to persuade, where he cou'd Command, and with importunity to obtain, what he might exact. He himself tells us that he admitted some to Communion, *tho' the People oppos'd and contradicted it.* In this Mr. *D.* says St. Cyprian *halted, and I have not acted uprightly in representing it.* In order to shew this, he translates a long Passage out of this Epistle, He begins in the middle of a Sentence, and proceeds no further than the two first Words, before he leaves out these remarkable Words. We [*who are to give an Account to the Lord*] *carefully considering*, &c. Mr. *D.* knew not how to shew, that the People at least equally concern'd in the Act of Discipline for he must be meant by *Nobis*) and yet, that he alone was to give an Account to God of it; he therefore drops these Words without giving any Notice to his Reader of it. In the next Omission he is more honest in intimating it, but equally culpable in other respects: These are the Words omitted [*their Crimes so hinder some, or the Brethren so obstinately and firmly oppose others, that they can't be receiv'd to the Danger and scandal of very many: For we are not so to gather up the Sherds, as to break the Sound and whole Vessels; nor is he a discreet and good Pastor, who by* ~~mixing~~ *the sickly infected Sheep with his Flock, hanes them all*] — These Words intimate that the Flock are at the Direction of the Pastor, that sometimes he does not admit them because greatly Criminal, sometimes because very offensive, that the avoiding Scandal was the Cause why St. *Cyprian* sought the Consent of the People. What can be plainer now than that St. *Cyprian* is an Evidence on my side, and that my Friend has endeavour'd to corrupt him? Can any Man in his Senses, think that St. *Cyprian* intended to say, the People had the Power jointly

with him, becauſe they were obſtinate or ſcrupulous, or ſcandaliz'd, or any thing elſe indeed; when he clearly makes the Matter of Diſcipline, he is ſpeaking of, an Act, for which he is accountable; the People his Flock, his Care; when he tells us he did this Act himſelf ſometimes, and only did not do it always becauſe he wou'd uſe his Authority ſo, as to give no Offence? ſee Ep. 59. Ed. *Ox.* p. 137. *The next Citation ſaid to be taken from Ep.* 10. *might have been found by Mr.* Holland *ſays our Author in the* 14 *Ep. of Bp.* Fell's Edition. It cou'd not, becauſe it never was in any Edition ſince the World was. The Words as extant in both Editions of the Sermon (p. 33.) are theſe [*Nec Epiſcopis licebat ſine Conſilio plebis, ſua privata Sententia quicquam facere*] But in the 14 Ep. we have no Words like them except theſe (p. 33.) [*A primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatuerim, nihil ſine conſilio veſtro, & ſine conſensu plebis, mea privatim Sententia gerere.*] Is it not ſtrange that there ſhou'd be a Man in the World, who ſhou'd cite an Author after this manner? Nothing can be ſtranger, except, that there is another, who pretends to have examin'd his Citations, and affirms they are true. The Sermon ſays from St. *Cyprian*, that *it is unlawful for Biſhops* to Act without their People. The Reply ſays, as St. *Cyprian* really did, that *he had determin'd* from the beginning of his Epiſcopate, not to do any thing, without the Advice of his Clergy and the Conſent of the People; from which Mr. *D.* concludes it was in his Thoughts unlawful to do ſo. This Inference is not only weak but ſuppoſing it true, makes St. *Cyprian* contradict himſelf: For in this very Ep. he commits the care of his Province to his Brethren of the Clergy in his Abſence, Inſtances in many particulars, and only refers the Buſineſs concerning which *Donatus*, &c. had wrote to him till his return, when he wou'd give it a public Conſideration; not that to do otherwiſe was unlawful; but that he had made it a Rule to himſelf to act ſo. Mr. *D.* wou'd make *Rigaltius* a Party in his Prevarication; but he is far from it. See his Note (p. 33.) *Cyprian.*

What he cites from Ep. 34. will do as little Service to his Cauſe: For firſt St. *Cyprian* commends the Presbyters and Deacons for forbidding to communicate with *Gaius* and his Deacon, upon the Advice of his Collegues, who were preſent; and he himſelf ſuſpends *Philumenus*, *Fortunatus* and *Favorinus*, tho' abſent, deferring

ring the further Cognizance of the Affair, as of great Importance, becauſe the Circumſtances were ſuch as wou'd not permit him to examine it throughly.

But Mr. *D*'s Opinion is not only held by St. *Cyprian*, but by 66. *Biſhops* in Council, as we may ſee in the Ep. to *Firmus* (64 Ep.) *Cyprian* and his Collegues blame *Therapius* for receiving *Victor* formerly a *Presbyter*, to Communion too ſoon, and without the deſire and knowledge of the Church. So far Mr. *D.* thought for his purpoſe; but the Ep. runs thus, *We have read your Letter, deareſt Brother, in which you ſignify to us, that* Therapius *had unreaſonably, and much too ſoon receiv'd* Victor *formerly a Presbyter, to Communion, before he had perform'd his full Penance and made Satisfaction to the Lord God whom he had offended. This thing hath greatly mov'd us, that the Authority of our Decree ſhou'd be broken, that a Perſon ſhou'd be reconcil'd before the full and legal Time, without the Deſire and Knowledge of the People; tho' no Sickneſs or Neceſſity either urged, or forc'd him upon this Action; but after a long Conſideration of the Matter, we think it ſufficient to reprove our Collegue* Therapius *for his raſh Act, and admoniſh him to do ſo no more. This notwithſtanding, we have not thought proper to take from* Victor, *what* Therapius *a Prieſt of God hath irregularly* [*uncanonically*] *given him,* [after ſuch manner as he pleas'd, not after that manner which was agreed upon among us] *and therefore we have permitted* Victor *to enjoy or uſe the Communion given him.* Here you may obſerve Mr. *D*'s Art, not only in impoſing 6 Abrupt Words upon his Reader, which ſeem'd for his purpoſe; but alſo in tranſlating *Plebis*. The Church, (It is plain to any honeſt ſenſible Man, that *Therapius* was reprov'd for breaking a prudential Decree of the Biſhops, not an Eſſential of Chriſtianity (2.) that a Synod of Biſhops, not only reprov'd *Therapius* for it without the People, but alſo ratify'd his Act, as the valid Act of God's Miniſter in Subſtance, tho' in Circumſtance irregular; but if St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion with his Collegues had been, what Mr. *D.* wou'd have it *i. e.* if they had given their Judgment, that the People ſhou'd bear a part, and yet excluded them they had acted irregularly themſelves. Again he cites a broken Sentence out of Ep. 43, in which nothing is more ſtrenuouſly contended for than the Authority of Biſhops, inſomuch that they are ſaid to be out of the Church, who rebell againſt them. We have another ſcrap from Ep. 16, that the Offenders ſhou'd plead their Cauſe be-

fore them and the Confeſſors, and the whole People, when God pleas'd to grant Peace. Here he betrays his Ignorance and Partiality together. For in the beginning of this Ep. St. *Cyprian* blames even Presbyters for receiving Offenders to Communion without their Biſhop, calls it an unparallel'd Preſumption; Says that Offenders receive the Right of Communion from the *Biſhop* and Clergy by Impoſition of Hands, that in this their irregular Act they impoſe upon the Brethren, calls them raſh, forward, and proud, who conſider not Man (meaning the *Biſhop*) nor Fear of God; threatens them with Cenſure according to the Power given him from God; ſuſpends them from Communion tho' abſent; and referrs the Hearing of their Cauſe, till he by God's Permiſſion is reſtor'd to the Church (*Deo permittente in ſinum Matris Eccleſiæ colligi cæperimus*) He does not ſo much as grant the Martyrs any Authority. *When he return'd* (for all Juriſdiction was at a ſtop without him or his Authority) *then they ſhall plead their Cauſe before me their Judge, offended by their Uſurpations before the Confeſſors to whom they have done deſpite, and the People they have abus'd.*

Ep. 17. He cites theſe Words of St. *Cyprian*, *That when the Lord ſhou'd grant Peace to the Church, and he ſhou'd return to them, all Things ſhou'd be examin'd in their Preſence, and they being Judges.* This is the latter Part of the Sentence; the Beginning runs thus: *The Bleſſed Martyrs have written to us concerning certain things, deſiring their Petitions may be examin'd; when I return in Peace, I'll do it before you all.* He goes on: *But I hear, notwithſtanding the Goſpel, and what theſe Martyrs have written, that ſome of the Presbyters uſurping the Biſhop's Authority, have receiv'd them to Communion, and themſelves have broken, that Rule they ought to have taught you to obſerve.*

Mr. *D.* tells us in the laſt Place, that his Sentiment prevail'd alſo in the Church of *Rome*; but there is nothing more in *Cornelius* his Ep. to *Cyprian* than this, that when the Biſhops, *&c.* thought fit to receive the Penitents, they told the whole Matter to the People, that they who had ſeen their Defection, might alſo be made ſenſible of their return. You may obſerve upon the whole, that Mr. *D.* in order to prove his Point, that the Power of conſtituting Miniſters is in the People, has cited ſeveral Paſſages from St. *Cyprian*, in all which he ſpeaks concerning the Laps'd, their Cenſure, or Reception; and ſays no more than, that they

were

were heard and receiv'd in the Preſence of the People, with their Knowledge and conſent, tho' not always; but he no where ought to be ſo cenſur'd, or receiv'd, he no where ſays, that they always were ſo receiv'd; it was indeed a Thing prudent and expedient not to oblige every one to avoid ſuch a Perſon without a very publick Conviction, nor receive ſuch an one without a general Teſtimony and Approbation. This is not only reaſonable to be ſuppos'd, upon conſidering the Nature of the Thing; but alſo was St. *Cyprian*'s Inducement for acting after this manner. Suppoſing therefore that we might conclude that Miniſter's were not to be conſtituted without the People, becauſe Offenders were not to be reconcil'd without them, Mr. *D.* wou'd ſtill fail in his Argument; for tho' Offenders were generally reconcil'd with their Approbation and Conſent, they were, and might be reconcil'd without it. The Neceſſity of the Fact therefore; not the Fact only ought to have been prov'd.

Not content with this Succeſs in St. *Cyprian*, from whoſe Writings he pretends to have prov'd undeniably, that tho' the executive Power of the Church was in the hands of the Clergy, they cou'd do nothing without the Conſent and Approbation of the People, he proceeds to ſhew the ſame from other Antients. Thus *Clemens* Romanus *advis'd the Schiſmatical Presbyters at Corinth, who were the Occaſion, if not the Cauſe, of the Diſturbance in that Church, that they ſhou'd ſubmit to the Church, and do what was requir'd by them, that this was the way to glorify God, which is I think, an undeniable Argument, that Biſhops in the Primitive Days, had great Reſpect to the Conſent of the People, in what they did in the Government of the Church.* But will this amount to a Proof, that the People are Eſſential in conſtituting a Miniſter? No. This Ep. indeed, and Mr. *D.* were never ſo well acquainted with one another, as to have any Friendſhip, and he ſcarce knew the general Purport of it. It was not the Presbyters, but the People, who were Schiſmatical and Seditious. *Clement* calls upon them more than once *to reverence the Prelates and honour the Presbyters*; he ſays (p. 145, Ed. Cotel.) *they had formerly been remarkable for it*, (p. 169.) are theſe Words. *The high Prieſt hath his Office, the Prieſts their proper Place, and the Levites their Miniſtry; the Laity are oblig'd to the Precepts given them.* This he accommodates to Chriſtianity, and exhorts every Man *thankfully to keep*

his

his own Station, and not tranſgreſs the preſcrib'd Rule. He ſuggeſts (p. 145.) and more plainly (p. 173, and 174) *that reſpect of Perſons, and giving preference to one Miniſter rather than another was the Cauſe of this Diſturbance, and affirms Sedition againſt Preſbyters to be a very foul Sin and unworthy Chriſtian Converſation,* (p. 178.) *he commands the People to repent and return to their obedience.* In ſhort there is only one place in which it is ſuggeſted, that any Miniſter was concern'd in this Schiſm, and indeed, that it is a very precarious one. But tho' the whole Tenor of this Piece talks of Obedience and Authority, ~~Allegiance~~, yet the great and good Man has thus expreſs'd himſelf: *Who therefore is ſtrong among you, who is merciful, who is full of Love? Let him ſay: If on my Account Diſturbances, Contentions and Schiſms are occaſion'd, I'll depart and go whither ye ſhall deſire, and I will do whatever ſhall be commanded by the Multitude, or People.* A noble inſtance of Chriſtian Fortitude and Paſtoral Affection; to have a Mind ſuperior to the Station and Dignity, tho' the Metropolis of the World, and to prefer the good of the People before a glorious Tenure of which no Man cou'd deprive him! But how from this can it be concluded, that the People have any Power at all? Had the Son of *Zaleucus* a right to his Father's Eye, becauſe the tender Father and the juſt Prince gave it for him? Had the *Jews* a right to have St. *Paul* devoted, becauſe his Affection for them wou'd have ſubmitted to it? Did not *Clement* ſpeak theſe Words (as he himſelf ſays) with an Eye to thoſe Kings and Princes who had given themſelves up to Death for the Deliverance of their Subjects; to thoſe Perſons who have taken the Chains upon them to redeem others, and have fed the Hungry at the coſt of their Liberty? If we had the ſame glorious Spirit now (Oh, that it wou'd return!) ſome Perſons cou'd not have the Senſe to diſcern it; but every Act of Heroic Goodneſs ſhou'd be a ground of ſacrilegious Uſurpation.

He produces *Valeſius* upon *Euſeb.* (Lib. 6. c. 44.) but if any Man pleaſes to conſult the whole Note, not Mr. *D*'s Fragment he will ſee that all intended there, was the Peoples Petition, not their Authority; and that the neceſſity (as is plain from St. *Cyprian*) was not ſuch an one, as proceeded upon the Suppoſition of any eſſential Right; but a prudential Conſtitution. Beſides this Comment of *Valeſius*, is ſo far from being in Mr. *D*'s Senſe, either the Opinion of *Valeſius* or his Au-

thor

thor, that the Latter plainly ſhews *Serapion* cou'd not be abſolv'd without the Presbyter, that none of the People wou'd ſo much as ſpeak for him; and laſtly, that he was abſolv'd without the People; and the Former affirms, that even the Power of a Presbyter without a Delegation from the Biſhop wou'd not do. Before I leave this Head I will make one obvious Note upon the Reconciliation of the Laps'd. I own it was the Cuſtom of the Church generally to admit thoſe, who were receiv'd to Communion at the Inſtance, and in the preſence of the People, except in Caſes of Neceſſity. In thoſe Caſes the Biſhop or Prieſt by his Authority did it without any Application except that of the Party himſelf, and without any publick Aſſembly. Now theſe latter Acts were always held as valid as the Former, which cou'd not have been, if the Peoples conſent had been Eſſential. Beſides the Caſes of Neceſſity were ſuch as ſeem'd to preclude all hopes of the Party's actual Communion in public, and conſequently all Scandal, and therefore not to come within the Notion of infringing that Diſcipline, which was only appointed to prevent Scandal.

Mr. *D.* proceeds now to the Power of conſtituting Miniſter's, and ſeems to tell his Reader, that I'm for *changing the Terms of the Queſtion.* No, by no means, all I deſign is, to try whether his Reaſon's for the Peoples Election, Approbation, Conſtitution, or whatever he'll pleaſe to call it, of Miniſters, as Eſſential, are ſo good as they ſhou'd be, to conclude for him. His firſt Inſtance of the Exerciſe of the People's Right is in the Choice of *Matthias* to fill up the Traytor's Place. I have given good Reaſons to believe, that the People had no more to do here than as Spectators (p. 20 of the Conſiderations) but ſince Mr. *D.* is not pleas'd with them, I will ſay ſomething more to the Point. Well then, granting what he wou'd have, the People did not chooſe *Matthias* as an Apoſtle, but they choſe *Matthias* and *Barnabas* as Candidates; for the Apoſtolate in order that one of them might ſucceed to it. By the Power, Election, Conſtitution of the People? No, the Lot determin'd the Point, God himſelf made the Apoſtle. This next Inſtance is, *of thoſe Perſons who carry'd the Charity of the Churches to the diſtreſs'd Brethren.* Theſe were choſen by the Churches for this very purpoſe, and were ſome of them Miniſters before: If any one therefore is inclin'd to believe, that the People have an undoubted

undoubted and Eſſential Right to elect or conſtitute their own Miniſters, becauſe they ſent certain Perſons of their own Appointment to deliver their Charity to the afflicted Brethren; it is I fancy out of the Power of Reaſon to do any good upon him. *He alſo mentions thoſe who were ſent to lay the Matter in diſpute at* Antioch *before the Synod at* Jeruſalem. The Argument runs thus, They that have Power to appoint Meſſengers to to lay an Affair which gives them uneaſineſs, before a Synod, have Power to appoint the Ambaſſadors of God, but the People have one; therefore the other. This reaſoning is not worthy ſerious Notice.

To come cloſe to the Point, the People choſe the Deacons. I ſuppoſe when we ſpeak of ordinary Officers we mean Officers, or Miniſters of the Word. Theſe Deacons were to ſerve Tables in Contradiſtinction to miniſtring in the Word of God; they were only choſe and preſented to the Apoſtles as ſuch; and yet after all, the People only look'd them out (ἐπισκέψασθε) as the Apoſtles directed v. 3. preſented them v. 6. [ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων] and the Apoſtles, as they had propos'd, v. 3. to conſtitute, or appoint them, [καταστήσαι] did it v. 6, by Impoſition of Hands. This is wonderous cloſe, the Fact has no Relation to what we are ſpeaking of, Miniſters of the Word! But ſuppoſe it had, there is not one Word apply'd to the People, which denotes Authority, what they are ſaid to do, was done by Order of the Apoſtles; this Order was not in the way of common Form, as when one Perſon has Authority to act, but muſt ſtay till he is bidd, and another Authority to bidd him, but can't refuſe it; for this was the firſt time ſuch a thing had happen'd, and therefore extraordinary; laſtly, the κατάστασις conſtitution appointment (Words always importing Authority, was the Apoſtles only. What Mr. *D.* has ſaid upon this Matter the Reader may conſult at leiſure, and deſpiſe. But Mr. *D.* wou'd have me prove, that the Apoſtles uſurp'd upon the Peoples Right in chooſing (an Authoritative chooſing, an Eſſential one) their ordinary Miniſters. No, they did not; for there cou'd be no Uſurpation where there was no Right. Prove then ſays he, that they did generally act in conſtituting their ordinary Officers without the Conſent of the People. Mr. *D.* has forgot that it was his buſineſs to prove they always acted with it; but not to

ſtand

ſtand upon Niceties with him, if he'll ſhew me any one ordinary Officer appointed in Scripture I will ſhew him that he was appointed without any Election at all. I had almoſt omitted the Conſideration of St. *Cyprian* upon St. *Matthias*'s Caſe. It was my Opinion, (and I was ſo happy as to have one of the moſt Learned Men in the Chriſtian World with me) that St. *Peter* ſpoke indeed in the preſence of many Diſciples, but only apply'd himſelf to the Apoſtles. St. *Cyprian* is of another Mind, (Ep. 67) it is very true; but tho' they agree in this, they differ in the main. For taking his Senſe altogether, he ſpeaks after this Manner. Under the Jewiſh Diſpenſation, it was commanded to ſet the Prieſt before the People, that ſo his Conſtitution might not be Clandeſtine, but juſt and legal, his Character being examin'd and clear'd by the Suffrage and Judgment of all. Now Mr. *D.* confeſſes *that the Prieſthood was not elective by the People under the Law.* This Cuſtom ſays St. *Cyprian*, was practis'd by thoſe under the Goſpel; this ſetting the Perſons before the People, not that they ſhou'd do any Act of Authority, or Eſſential in the Conſtitution of Miniſters; but ſhou'd give Teſtimony, whether the Candidates were good or bad Men. Thus it is indeed agreed between Mr. *D.* and St. *Cyprian*, that St. *Peter* ſpoke to the People; but what St. *Cyprian* ſays upon the Caſe concludes only for the People's Teſtimony, not their Authority. They have no ſeparate inherent Eſſential Right to chooſe, much leſs to conſtitute; and tho' it was admitted, that they chooſe (which never can be prov'd from Scripture) by ſuch a Right, that Choice was to ſtand or fall at the Pleaſure of the Apoſtles, was no more than a mere Teſtimony of a Perſon's Worth, and if not well grounded, might have been rejected. Mr. *D.* muſt excuſe me, if I give no other Anſwer to *Beza* and *Aretius* than this, that he ought not to have objected to me the Citing *Beza* from another, becauſe I told him I had done it, and that their Authorities weigh very little with me in this Caſe. If they are of an Opinion contrary to Scripture and Antiquity, let them take them that pleaſe. I much queſtion however, whether they are of Mr. *D*'s Mind. that the People conſtituted, not only chooſe their Miniſters, and that the Choice made by them was good and valid, without any after Act of the Clergy.

The next Instance is that of Acts 14. v. 23. *And when they* (Paul *and* Barnabas) *had ordain'd them Elders in every Church, and had pray'd with Fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believ'd.* The Word χειροτονέω is what we have Translated Ordain'd; *but the true Protestant Translation, it seems, is Ordain'd by Election. Now this Election must be by the People, and of Consequence here was a Popular Election, such a Constitution of Ministers as was good without Imposition of Hands or with it; for what further Power cou'd drop from the Fingers of the Apostles upon the Noddles of the ordain'd, or what Occasion for something that signifies nothing?* I answer'd his Argument here by saying (1.) That the Word χειροτονέω does not signify Election only, *which he allows*; that it does not signify Election, by stretching out the Hand only, *but also simple Constitution, which he also allows.* If then the Force of this Argument depends upon the *Protestant Translation*, Ordaining by Election, he ought to have prov'd that, tho' it is taken in many Senses, the *Protestant Sense is* the only one to be understood here. He attempts this and Questions whether Paul *and* Barnabas *cou'd properly* χειροτονεῖν, *being only two.* Against this I shew'd him, that the Word had been apply'd to one only, nay to a Creature without Hands. To this his reply is nothing but Scurrility. Mr. *D.* has in Print and otherwise, been so desirous to depreciate me, that I have never expected any civility from him. I'm not concern'd, whether any Man believes I ow'd those Citations to Mr. *Pool*, or my own Reading; but if any of Mr. *D*'s Friends please, I'll produce the *Paris* Edition of *Philo*, the *Oxford* Edition of *Maximus Tyrius*, and the *Hagenaw* Edition of *Lucian*, all confirming what they are alledg'd to prove. I affect not to be esteem'd a Man of vast Reading, and ~~universally~~ *intimately* acquainted with *uncommon Authors*, nor indeed in the Matter before us, is there any Occasion. I thank God I know my Bible as well as *some Protestants*, and have read there, that God (*Acts* 10. *v.* 40 and 41.) *rais'd up his Son the Third Day, and shew'd him openly*, not to all the People, but, to *Witnesses chosen before, by Election if* Mr. D. pleases (προκεχειροτονημένοις) of God, *&c.* To use no more Words, Mr. *D.* shall have any thing he desires here, χειροτονέω shall be taken in *its more proper and common Use*, as he elegantly speaks, or in its Figurative and Catechestical one. Let *Schrevelius* or *Scapula*, or *Symson*, or *Leigh*, or *Ravanel*, or *Amesius*,

or

or Aretius *the great Divine and Critick*, or *Calvin*, or *Bullinger*, or *Eraſmus*, or *Arias Montanus*, or *Stephens*, or *Paſor*, or the Rights of the Chriſtian Church, or *Diodate*, or the *Switz*, *French*, *Italian*, and *Belgiec* Tranſlators, or Mr. *Daviſon*, or any other Perſon render it. Let it be uſed in the *Proteſtant Senſe*, or the Popiſh, it ſhall be all one to me. It ſtands in Company with other Words, and denotes an Action. I ſuppoſe then the beſt way of knowing who were concern'd in this Action, who perform'd it (be it Ordination, Election, Conſtitution, or what it will) is to look into the Words, and obſerve the Syntax. *When they* [*Paul and Barnabas*] *had preach'd the Goſpel to that City, and had taught many, they returned again to* Lyſtra, Iconium, *and* Antioch *confirming the Souls of the Apoſtles, and exhorting them to continue in the Faith, and that we muſt through much Tribulation enter into the Kingdom of God; and when they had ordain'd them Elders in every Church and had pray'd with Faſting, they commended them to the Lord in whom they believ'd.* Let the Senſe of χειροτονέω be what it will then, St. *Paul* and *Barnabas* are the χειροτονήσαντες, to them only it is applicable. The Grammar of the Text makes all the Citations, from Lexicographers and Critics mere Impertinence. Perhaps Mr. *D.* has got a Proteſtant Grammar of his own againſt us. One Favour I deſire, that, ſince it is affirm'd χειροτονήσαντες ſignifies in this Place, ordaining by the Election of the People, I may have one Inſtance from any Author, in which it appears that χειροτονέω means the Chooſing, Ordaining, or conſtituting of one by the Hands of another. I ſhall purſue this Matter no further, ſince it would lead me to defend what Mr. *D. calls a School-Boy's Declamation, which is too Empty and Vain for* Polemics, *his ſingular Province.*

As for his laſt Inſtance (Acts 13. 1.) my Anſwer was, that the only Perſons there ſpoken of, were Teachers and Prophets. To them the Holy Ghoſt ſaid, ſeparate or ſet a Part, conſecrate me *Barnabas* and *Paul*, *&c.* The Election, if we muſt have one, was made by the Holy Ghoſt. No, *Mr.* D. *ſays, that the Part which the Holy Ghoſt had, was a Nomination, and wonders I can't diſtinguiſh between Nomination and Election.* Not to differ with Mr. *D.* about ſmall Matters; I'll ſay as he would have me. The Nomination was by the Holy Ghoſt, the Impoſition of Hands and ſending them away was by the Prophets and Teachers, and the Election is no where mention'd. But to be ſure, tho' the Holy Ghoſt

nominate the People muſt chooſe, and a Proteſtant Tranſlator wou'd as ſoon find the Electors out, as he did in the Caſe before. He advertiſes the Reader, that *the Miſtake of Nomination for Election, runs through my Conſiderations; whereas, nothing can be plainer, than, that I diſtinguiſh them*, grant an Election, but queſtion the Neceſſity or Eſſentiality of it. *He ſays, this Caſe is like one in our Conſtitution. The Holy Ghoſt nominates, the People Elect, and the Prophets ordain, the King nominates, the Dean and Chapter Elect, and the Biſhops conſecrate.* I wiſh the Caſes were entirely Parallel; but as it is, the greateſt Oppoſer of the Popular Scheme, will agree to end the Matter with him upon this Parallel. If the People claim no more, nor upon any other Foundation, than the Dean and Chapter of a Vacant See enjoy, it is not worth an Argument. it is rather nominal than real, and becauſe of humane Appointment only, not eſſential. The Reader, I hope, will obſerve how eaſy I am with Mr. *D.* when I admit this Text as any Inſtance at all.

Mr. *D.* proceeds now to defend that little Primo-primitive Antiquity we had from him. *He confeſſes his Error in the Citation of the Centuriators, tells us the Edition he us'd, and agrees to ſtand by the Words, as they are truly cited by me*, very Fair and Candid. But, that the Words χληρος χληροῦν ſhew, that it was uſual for the Churches to chooſe Miniſters by Lot, I ſaid ſ was groundleſs. *The Conjecture was taken from the genuine Senſe, common uſe and Signification of thoſe Words*, may be ſo. But ſuch Arguments are very weak for the moſt Part, becauſe, after you know the ſtrict Senſe of the Word, you muſt enquire whether your Author us'd it in that Senſe or in another. In the Caſe before us, it will appear that he did not; for very few, if any Elections, of Miniſters are by *Euſebius reported to be made* by Lott, and the generality are expreſly ſaid to be made another way. What Mr. *D.* extended to two Centures and an Half, he will find it difficult to prove ever practis'd, except once. This he ſays, was *the People chooſing their Miniſters not the chooſing by Lott.* Let Mr. *D.* Anſwer himſelf, p. 44. of the correct Edition of his Sermon, he writes thus: *But yet we find that this Antient and laudable Cuſtom continued in the Churches till about the middle of the third Century; for till then, the* Magdeburg *Centuriators ſay, it was uſual to chooſe their Miniſters by Lott.* I affirm'd, that a Choice by Lott, was no more

more a Conſtitution of the People, than a Divine or Providential Appointment was a humane Proviſion. To this Mr. *D.* ſays, *that a choice by Lott, is an Evidence that the People choſe.* An Election and an Evidence of it are two Things unleſs Mr. *D.* admits of proving *idem per idem*. Beſides, a Choice by Lot is not an Evidence that the People choſe; for Lots may as well prevent any Voting at all, as determine, when there is a Parity of Voices. How Contradictory and Weak is this whole Sentence! He laughs at my calling a Deſignation by Lot, *a Divine Appointment*, and yet himſelf calls it *the Divine Arbitrament and Providential.* He ſays, *the End of caſting Lots is, that, that ſhou'd be* decided by them, which cou'd not by Votes. He might have found a great many other Ends with a little Thought; but not to be tedious, I refer the Reader to Mr. *Gataker* upon this Subject. He tells us, *that this was the Caſe of* Matthias *and* Barſabas, *the Votes were equal, and ſo they went to the Lot.* This is a Popiſh Interpretation I'm afraid; here is ſomething ſaid to be in the Text which no Body can find there. True Proteſtants ſhou'd take care of theſe Slips, other Perſon's may plead Cuſtom for it. But I purſue this Matter no further; I've done with it, as far as it concerns the Queſtion, and ſhall willingly leave Mr. *D.* in Poſſeſſion of every thing elſe in his Book.

He complains of my Reflection *upon the Paucity of Authors cited by him, and thinks I ſhou'd not have expected more in the Compaſs of a Sermon.* Not more than two, out of the ſame Book, in a Sermon of 96 p. printed frugally, preach'd before an Audience, that might expect ſomething beſides Harrangue and Application, even before an Aſſembly of DIVINES, and intended to be publiſh'd, as the Sum of what had paſs'd between him and me in Writing upon this Queſtion. The Margin might have referr'd to places without Number, and at the Pains of half a Page more, he might have made an Handſome Appearance in Citations. But pray, it was no Fault in Mr. *D.* to cite ſo little in 96 p. was it any in me in 48 p. only, to examine what he had alledged? Was not I upon the Defenſive; and if ſo, was it not ſufficient for me to ward off his heavy Blows? When I was call'd out to engage with ſuch a Champion publickly, did not Caution and reſerve become me? When I was ſcandalouſly reported to have had Aſſiſtence, and that from

a Hand

a Hand wicked enough to impoſe upon my Ignorance, what an imprudent thing wou'd it have been to throw away more Learning, upon my Adverſary, when I was forc'd to borrow the little I had, on ſuch hard Terms as the Loſs of my Reputation? But I forbear, Mr. *D*'s ample Collection in his Reply, has made full Amends for the Defects of his Sermon. Before I enter upon this Task, I deſire my Reader to obſerve the Queſtion between us. Tho' Mr. *D. aſſerts Election, I don't deny it; But as he ſays it was Neceſſary and Eſſential, I ſay it was not. That it was admitted and made uſe of for prudent Purpoſes; but when omitted, did not invalidate the Orders. that it was an Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom not a Divine Law is what I affirm.* So far then, as he proves not only the Fact, but the neceſſity of it, ſo far he proves for himſelf; but ſo far as he only eſtabliſhes the bare Fact, he proves nothing but what I own. *Pontius* then ſays, *St.* Cyprian *was choſen to the Office of Biſhop by the Judgment of God and Favour of the People; therefore the Election of the People was neceſſary and Authoritative.* What a Conſequence is this! I ſhould rather imagine from the Words, that the People's Favour ſignify'd nothing as to his Conſtitution, when he actually was choſen by the Judgment of God: What Eſſential cou'd be wanting after this, or with it? Why muſt this Favour be Authoritative? The Paſſage indeed can no further be preſs'd into Mr. *D*'s Service, than to ſhew, that the People greatly deſir'd St. *Cyprian* for their Biſhop, (as *Pontius* ſays in another Place) and were mightily pleas'd, when they were gratify'd in it: As little will the Citation from St. *Cyprian* borrow'd from the Learned *Du Pin* do for him. For the Words Mr. *D.* inſiſts upon don't come up to the Point. He is not there giving all the Circumſtances and Conditions of a Valid Ordination (for then he wou'd have mention'd Prayer and Impoſition of Hands) but he is acquainting *Cornelius* what publick Teſtimonies he had of his Epiſcopate ſo as to make it indiſputably clear to all Ingenious Minds. *I was choſen by the Voice of all, as the Succeſſor of a deceas'd Biſhop, in Communion with all my Collegues, approv'd in my Epiſcopate four Years by my People* (Mr. *D.* if he had ever ſeen this Epiſtle, wou'd have had no Occaſion for that extaaordinary Chronological Remark he takes from *Du Pin*) *perſecuted under the Name of a Biſhop* &c. If in the preſent Times a Clergy-Man ſhould thus defend himſelf from the Suſpicion of not being really

one:

one: [I was publiſh'd as having Intention for Orders, examin'd, approv'd by all, and have now Letters to teſtify that I receiv'd them: Nay theſe Letters have alſo been frequently exhibited. Thoſe of the ſame Order eſteem'd me ſuch, and the Perſons who hated the Order perſecuted my Perſon for it] wou'd any Man therefore conclude, that ſuch a Perſon was elected by the People, and, that their Approbation was held Neceſſary and Eſſential? *Papianus*.

As for the *Epiſtle* to [illegible], i'm ſure there are no ſuch Words in it, as Mr. *D.* pretends to cite from it, and if *Du Pin* has affirm'd the ſame Thing, with great Submiſſion he is miſtaken. St. *Cyprian* ſays [*that the People united to their Biſhop are a Church, that God had vouchſaf'd to commit the People to him, that he is made their Lord, Judge and Maſter, that the Biſhops ſucceeded the Apoſtles; he plainly defends himſelf againſt the Charges of Pride, Severity*, &c. *and takes upon him the Powers of Cenſure and Reconciliation without any Limitation*, &c.] but he ſays nothing, that Mr. *D.* cites him for.

Euſebius is cited and chaſtis'd in the next Place; what I ſaid from him concerning *Fabian*, I muſt ſtill maintain; I deſire any Perſon to conſider the Caſe, and alſo the Title of the Chap. cited (Lib. 6. c. xxix) which is *Euſebius*'s and runs thus [*concerning* Fabian, *how he was wonderfully conſtituted Biſhop of* Rome, *by God*] I will here make Mr. *D.* as many Conceſſions as can in Reaſon be deſir'd; it ſhall be ſaid the People choſe him by a miraculous Direction: How did they expreſs themſelves? They ſhouted out (which *Valeſius* ſays was the Cuſtomary Form at Elections) *that he was worthy*; Of what? Of the Biſhoprick; and does every one immediately become Maſter of what he deſerves? Is a good Character a *Biſhoprick* inſtantly? Are Perſons in Authority in the very Exerciſe of their Authority, us'd to give their Opinion inſtead of their Judgment, to appeal to others for what they can do themſelves, to deſire, to repreſent, or even to remonſtrate what they themſelves can Act? *After* Fabian's *Death, they* [*the People*] *choſe* Cornelius. *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, ſucceeded *Hero* many Years before *Fabian*; but we muſt look over a Heap of Miſtakes, here he means *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*; I had ſaid, the Hiſtorian ſays nothing of his Election, *true*; *but, ſays Mr.* D. *St* Cyprian does; Now what is it, that St *Cyprian* ſays of *Cornelius*? That Clergy and Laity, Old and Orthodox Men approv'd his being

being made Biſhop, he no where ſays, that he was promoted to it by the Authority of the People; read this whole Paragraph p. 103, and 104, of the *Oxford* Edition: See *Dodwel*'s ſeventh Cyprianic Diſſertat. *&c.*

I acknowledge Mr. *D.* in the Right, *when he blames me for ſaying, that he has only produc'd one Father's Opinion*; he has indeed produ'd more, tho' to no Purpoſe; but then, in telling me my Conſcience muſt rebuke me for ſaying, he has not cited one decree of of any Council, he is miſtaken; for the Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian* and his Collegues is as different from a Decree, as, Advice or Exhortation is from Authority. Mr. *D.* does not think fit to proceed in Defence of his Decree, I mean this Synodical Epiſtle; but propoſes to recommend to me ſome other Teſtimonies from Councils ſhewing, that the People did not only in Fact chooſe their Miniſters, but alſo had a Right to do it. The firſt is the Synodical Epiſtle of the *Nicene*, Council, as we have it in *Socrates* (Lib. 1. c. ix.) The Part, which Mr. *D.* makes uſe of, is, that where they deprive *Melitius* and his Followers of all Authority, and preſcribe to them the Terms of Reſtoration, without any Authority from the People. The Words Mr. *D.* inſiſts upon are theſe, *that thoſe who were Penitent, and admitted as ſuch, might in Caſe of Vacancy ſucceed, if they were thought worthy and the People chooſe them, but not this neither, without the Confirmation of the Biſhop of* Alexandria: What Authority is here in the People! What they have here is given them by the Synod, and, that can only be Eccleſiaſtical, Humane, Subordinate and Defeaſible, not Neceſſary and Divine. We pardon Mr. *D*'s ſecond Miſtake of a Synodical Epiſtle, for a Conciliar Decree.

The next Citation is, from what the Council of *Antioch* wrote to the Emperor *Conſtantine, they inform'd him, that* Euſebius *was choſen by the* Antiocheans, *and requeſted of the Emperor, that he might go thither*; Conſtantine refuſes to grant their requeſt (*he had, no doubt, a wonderful Opinion of the Peoples Authority*) and adviſes them to look out ſuch an one as they wanted, without Noiſe and Tumult; he adviſes the Clergy to propoſe ſome Perſons to the People, ſuch as they thought worthy, and to ſteer the Affair ſo, as to prevent a Tranſlation, which was uncanonical. Here, then it is ſaid, that the Emperor rejected their Election, and no more is imply'd or expreſs'd, than, that the People were call'd to give Teſtimony and Elect, tho' at the ſame Time they

they were oblig'd by Canons made by the Clergy to elect according to such Qualifications. *Valesius* does not say, that here we have the true Form of Antient Elections; and if Mr. *D.* wou'd have read this Note more carefully he wou'd have found, that the Proposing the προχειρισμὸν the Names of Persons to the People, was only, that Testimony might be given whether they were worthy or not, for the Election was made before by the Clergy. Upon this Authority, we must observe (1.) This Epistle of *Constantine*, is neither Conciliar nor Decretory; and (2.) That it annulls an Election of the People, which cou'd not be, if, as Mr. *D.* says, it was Essential, Necessary, the very Constitution of a Minister, and therefore not to be Defeated or Rul'd by any Ecclesiastical Canon.

Mr. *D.* brings two Canons from *Du Pin* made in another Council at *Antioch*, both of them superseding the Authority of the People. *If any Bishop* (Canon 16.) *who has no Bishoprick, invade a Vacant Church without the Authority of a Synod, he shall be driven from it, tho' the People of the Church, whereof he is Bishop, shall choose him.* Here in the first Place you may observe, that the Authority of the Synod, is superior to the People's Choice; and then, that the Choice of the People in this Canon is not to the Office of a Bishop, but to the Place of exercising it; and Lastly, that it acknowledges Bishops without Sees, and therefore not elected by their Flock. *If a Bishop* (Can. 18.) *ordain'd for a Bishoprick, refuse to accept it, he is to be Excommunicated; but, if it be not his Fault, that he does not go to this Church; but because the People of it will not receive him, he shall retain the Honour and Place of a Bishop, provided he do not in any wise trouble the Church wherein he shall continue* [by exercising his Episcopal Function there, without the Permission of the proper Bishop] He is a Bishop, then who is ordain'd such, tho' the People for whom he is ordain'd don't receive him; and the Matter in Dispute (which Mr. *D.* conceals, or perhaps never knew, for *Du Pin* omits it) is to be determin'd adds the Canon, [*not by the People*] *but by a Provincial Synod.* He goes on, but what he means, except to make Proof for me, I can't imagine. The same Author, *Du Pin* (Cent. v. p. 216.) tells us, that a Council held at *Rome* by *Innocent* the I. in Canon the Tenth, *forbids those to be ordain'd Bishops, who have exercis'd secular Functions, tho' they were chosen by the People.* This Canon also tells us

ſomething more in the Words immediately following, (*becauſe their* [*the People's*] *Approbation is of no Force, except when they chooſe one worthy of that Office.* This is Conſcience! He alſo tells us of another Council at *Milevis*, which ordain'd (Cent. v. p. 217.) *that a Letter ſhou'd be ſent to* Maximinianus *Biſhop of* Vaga, *and to his People. In that to his People they Decree, that they ſhou'd depoſe him and oblige him to withdraw, and, that they ſhou'd chooſe another*, but *Du Pin's* Words are: *The Council ordain'd, that a Letter ſhou'd be ſent both to him and his People, to oblige him to withdraw, and, that the People ſhou'd chooſe another.* Either *Du Pin* or his Tranſlators, are not ſo clear as they might be; For the Canon, which is the 88 in the African Code, runs thus: *That Letters be written to* Maximinian *to recede from his Biſhoprick, and to his People, that they requeſt another Biſhop.* It is the 91. Canon in Biſhop *Beveridge's* Collect. Vol. 1. p. 624. and the Word tranſlated chooſe is ἐπιζητήσωσιν. Here is another Specimen of Honeſty and Exactneſs; but indeed Mr. *D.* may well be excus'd, when the Learned *Du Pin* and his excellent Tranſlators have err'd.

I will add, ſays he, the Determination of a greater Council than all theſe, which I find in a Book admir'd by Mr: H. and cited by him, and which muſt be of great Authority with him, I mean the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. I never cited the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions nor admir'd them at all, that this Man cou'd know; but he confounds the Canons with the Conſtitutions, and has ſo little Knowledge of theſe Matters, that he can't diſtinguiſh between a glorious Body of Eccleſiaſtical Laws and a ſpurious interpolated Book; But what does he cite from it? *A Paſſage in which we are told, that the People muſt be examin'd over and over to the good Character of the Perſon to be ordain'd, and ask'd upon the Propoſing him, whether they wou'd have him conſtituted their Miniſter.* The Election is not Authoritative, nor does it appear to be by the People but by the Biſhops, *&c.* for if you read ἀπὸ for ὑπὸ and render the Words *choſen out of the whole People, the Sence will be better. After he is nam'd, and pleaſes; Whom? the whole People?* If he was choſen by them, ſure they can't want to know his Name, nor wou'd they chooſe one that did not pleaſe them. On this Suppoſition then, our Author lays the Streſs upon a Miſtake, nor is the Caſe any better, if we read the Words as they are in the Editions [*he muſt be choſen by the whole People, then being nam'd and pleaſing;*

Whom?

Whom? the Clergy? Is this then, all the People's Authority? The Perſon choſen by them ſhall be a Miniſter if he pleaſes the Clergy: There are other Parts of theſe Conſtitutions (to name one Lib. 7. c. xlvi.) which are inconſiſtent with Mr. *D*'s Scheme, and ſuppoſing his Notion of Miſſion Divine and Eſſential, reflect highly upon the Apoſtles; for in the Place mention'd they tell us, who they particularly conſtituted and ſent, without any regard to the People. Here Mr. D. concludes his Councils, all of them being either directly againſt him or not for him. There is no Occaſion for a very Critical Knowledge of the Councils to prove, that ſometimes the People were permitted to elect, ſometimes forbid, and had no Eſſential Right of their own. There are very many Canons which expreſs and imply this; but not to be tedious to my Reader, I will give him one, Canon the 29. of that moſt early *Code* commonly call'd *Apoſtolical*, in ſome Ed. particularly Biſhop *Beveridge*, 36. *If a Biſhop does not accept the Cure aſſign'd him, and the Reaſon of it is the Perverſneſs of his People, let him remain the Biſhop, and let the Clergy of the City be ſuſpended from Communion, becauſe they have not diſciplin'd ſuch a refactory People.* This Canon ſuppoſes it in the Breaſt of the Biſhops, and not of the People to ſupply a Vacant See, by electing a new Biſhop. He proceeds now to *confirm* the Authority of the moſt ſolemn Eccleſiaſtical Decrees by the ſingle Suffrages of Antient and Modern Authors.

Firſt then we have *Clemens* Romanus (p. 171, and 172.) who ſays, *that Miniſters were conſtituted by the Conſent of the whole Church*, (the Favour and good Opinion is a better Tranſlation) Even here the κατάσασις is attributed to the Apoſtles and other eminent Perſons, and no Authority of the People mention'd, beſides, as tho' St. *Clement* had intended to prevent any Concluſion from theſe Words for the People's Power, he has ſaid, (p. 170.) *that the Apoſtles ordain'd the firſt Fruits of their Converſion, Biſhops and Deacons of thoſe who ſhou'd believe*; Where cou'd the Election of the People be then? The Paſſage out of *Ignatius* is ſtrangely us'd, and at laſt of no Service. Take it entire (p. 33. Vol. 2.) *ſince it is told me, according to your Prayer and your Bowels in Chriſt Jeſus, that the Church of* Antioch *in* Syria *is in Peace* [free from Perſecution] *it becomes you as a Church of God, to chooſe a Miniſter, to go thither upon a Divine Embaſſy to congratulate them publickly, and glorify the Name* [of God] *Bleſſed is he in Chriſt*

ſomething more in the Words immediately following, (*becauſe their* [*the People's*] *Approbation is of no Force, except when they chooſe one worthy of that Office*. This is Conſcience! He alſo tells us of another Council at *Milevis*, which ordain'd (Cent. v. p. 217.) *that a Letter ſhou'd be ſent to* Maximinianus *Biſhop of* Vaga, *and to his People. In that to his People they Decree, that they ſhou'd depoſe him and oblige him to withdraw, and, that they ſhou'd chooſe another*, but *Du Pin's* Words are: *The Council ordain'd, that a Letter ſhou'd be ſent both to him and his People, to oblige him to withdraw, and, that the People ſhou'd chooſe another.* Either *Du Pin* or his Tranſlators, are not ſo clear as they might be; For the Canon, which is the 88 in the African Code, runs thus: *That Letters be written to* Maximinian *to recede from his Biſhoprick, and to his People, that they requeſt another Biſhop.* It is the 91. Canon in Biſhop *Beveridge's* Collect. Vol. 1. p. 624. and the Word tranſlated chooſe is ἐπιζητήσωσιν. Here is another Specimen of Honeſty and Exactneſs; but indeed Mr. *D.* may well be excus'd, when the Learned *Du Pin* and his excellent Tranſlators have err'd.

I will add, ſays he, *the Determination of a greater Council than all theſe, which I find in a Book admir'd by Mr:* H. *and cited by him, and which muſt be of great Authority with him, I mean the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.* I never cited the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions nor admir'd them at all, that this Man cou'd know; but he confounds the Canons with the Conſtitutions, and has ſo little Knowledge of theſe Matters, that he can't diſtinguiſh between a glorious Body of Eccleſiaſtical Laws and a ſpurious interpolated Book; But what does he cite from it? *A Paſſage in which we are told, that the People muſt be examin'd over and over to the good Character of the Perſon to be ordain'd, and ask'd upon the Propoſing him, whether they wou'd have him conſtituted their Miniſter.* The Election is not Authoritative, nor does it appear to be by the People but by the Biſhops, *&c.* for if you read ἀπὸ for ὑπὸ and render the Words *choſen out of the whole People, the Sence will be better. After he is nam'd, and pleaſes; Whom? the whole People?* If he was choſen by them, ſure they can't want to know his Name, nor wou'd they chooſe one that did not pleaſe them. On this Suppoſition then, our Author lays the Streſs upon a Miſtake, nor is the Caſe any better, if we read the Words as they are in the Editions [*he muſt be choſen by the whole People, then being nam'd and pleaſing*; Whom?

Whom? the Clergy? Is this then, all the People's Authority? The Perſon choſen by them ſhall be a Miniſter if he pleaſes the Clergy: There are other Parts of theſe Conſtitutions (to name one Lib. 7. c. xlvi.) which are inconſiſtent with Mr. *D*'s Scheme, and ſuppoſing his Notion of Miſſion Divine and Eſſential, reflect highly upon the Apoſtles; for in the Place mention'd they tell us, who they particularly conſtituted and ſent, without any regard to the People. Here Mr. D. concludes his Councils, all of them being either directly againſt him or not for him. There is no Occaſion for a very Critical Knowledge of the Councils to prove, that ſometimes the People were permitted to elect, ſometimes forbid, and had no Eſſential Right of their own. There are very many Canons which expreſs and imply this; but not to be tedious to my Reader, I will give him one, Canon the 29. of that moſt early *Code* commonly call'd *Apoſtolical*, in ſome Ed. particularly Biſhop *Beveridge*, 36. *If a Biſhop does not accept the Cure aſſign'd him, and the Reaſon of it is the Perverſneſs of his People, let him remain the Biſhop, and let the Clergy of the City be ſuſpended from Communion, becauſe they have not diſciplin'd ſuch a refactory People.* This Canon ſuppoſes it in the Breaſt of the Biſhops, and not of the People to ſupply a Vacant See, by electing a new Biſhop. He proceeds now to *confirm* the Authority of the moſt ſolemn Eccleſiaſtical Decrees by the ſingle Suffrages of Antient and Modern Authors.

Firſt then we have *Clemens* Romanus (p. 171, and 172.) who ſays, *that Miniſters were conſtituted by the Conſent of the whole Church*, (the Favour and good Opinion is a better Tranſlation) Even here the κατάσασις is attributed to the Apoſtles and other eminent Perſons, and no Authority of the People mention'd, beſides, as tho' St. *Clement* had intended to prevent any Concluſion from theſe Words for the People's Power, he has ſaid, (p. 170.) *that the Apoſtles ordain'd the firſt Fruits of their Converſion, Biſhops and Deacons of thoſe who ſhou'd believe*; Where cou'd the Election of the People be then? The Paſſage out of *Ignatius* is ſtrangely us'd, and at laſt of no Service. Take it entire (p. 33. Vol. 2.) *ſince it is told me, according to your Prayer and your Bowels in Chriſt Jeſus, that the Church of* Antioch *in* Syria *is in Peace* [free from Perſecution] *it becomes you as a Church of God, to chooſe a Miniſter, to go thither upon a Divine Embaſſy to congratulate them publickly, and glorify the Name* [of God] *Bleſſed is he in Chriſt*

Jesus, who shall be thought worthy such a Ministry; and you also shall be glorify'd. Now if you will, you may do it, for the Name of God, as well as the Neighbouring Churches, which have sent some of them Bishops, some Priests and Deacons. I have Translated the Words [χειροτονῆσαι Διάκονον, to chooſe a Miniſter] for a Reaſon, every one may ſee. In the laſt Words of this Place, he adviſes the *Philadelphians* to do as the other Churches had done, to chooſe a Miniſter, or Ambaſſador, not a Deacon, for the other Churches had choſe ſome of them Biſhops, and ſome of them Prieſts and Deacons for this Miniſtry; (1.) it is plain this was not an ordinary Miniſter; for he ſays, if ye be willing, you *may* chooſe ſuch an one; but they *muſt* chooſe ordinary Miniſters; (2.) this was not Advice to conſtitute Miniſters, but to appoint thoſe to ſerve in a certain Affair, who were conſtituted. *Do as the other Churches have done*; now they have *ſent ſome Biſhops, others Prieſts*, &c.

Gregory Nazianzen *ſays of* Athanaſius, *that he was promoted to the Throne of St.* Mark *after, a Spiritual and Apoſtolical Manner, not by the Force and Violence of a contending Party, but by the Unanimous Voice of all* If Mr. *D.* wou'd have been accurate in this Matter, he might have conſulted the Synodical Letter of the Biſhops of *Egypt, Thebais, Lybia,* and *Pentapolis* (*Tom.* 1. *p.* 1. *Op. Athanas, p.* 128, *and* 129.) rather than a Panegyrick; But there alaſs, he wou'd have found nothing but *Petition, Importunity* and *Teſtimonial.*

What Mr. *D.* tells us, that theſe People were conſulted in Elections, *from the Centuriators and* Du Pin. we allow, and leave him to make the moſt of it. Not content with theſe Illuſtrious Antients and Moderns, he proceeds to give us a Choice Collection made to his Hand out of the Rights of the Chriſtian Church; this is robbing a Pick-Pocket, that Author has ſcarce any thing that is honeſtly gotten. I might refer the Reader here, to thoſe ſeveral Learned Anſwers he has had, but to oblige Mr. *D.* I'll conſider the Authorities as his own. We have ſpoken to *Clemens Romanus* already, where *Anacletus* has declar'd himſelf upon this Queſtion, we are not told, but if he was of this Opinion, it is ſtrange that he ſhou'd accept the *Roman* See upon *ſuch wicked Terms*; for *Euſebius* ſays, (p. 70.) That after *Linus* had govern'd the Church twelve Years [Ἀγκλήτῳ τὰυτην παραδίδωσι) *he ſurrender'd or deliver'd it up* to Anacletus. So *Clemens* to *Euariſtus* and many others

which

which occurr in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. *The Aſſertion that in the firſt three Centuries one Inſtance can be given of a Biſhop made without the Election of the Church*, is both Falſe and Inconſequential This Cuſtom of Election was Humane, and Circumſtantial; therefore, tho' the Biſhops were not made without it, it does not follow that they could not be made without it. But beſides, the Biſhops were often made without it in the moſt pure and early Times. I have given Inſtances of two, and might add more, if it was neceſſary. How ſcandalouſly has he perverted the Synodical Epiſtle of the Famous Council of *Nice* to the Church of *Alexandria*? Theodoret, (p. 31. Lib. 1. c. viii.) He makes that general, which the Synod only ſpeaks of the *Melitians* in particular, the Words are theſe: *And if it ſhall happen, that if any of thoſe who are in the Church ſhall die, thoſe who are now received may ſucceed, if they appear worthy, and the People chooſe them, provided, that the Biſhop of* Alexandria *Ratify and Confirm the Election.* Here's a Citation to prove the People's Power! The Ordinations of *Nectarius* and *Flavian* were in Council, nor is any more ſaid of the People's Power, than, that they unanimouſly aſſented to what the Biſhops did. (*Theod.* Lib. 5. c. viii and ix. p. 206, 207, *&c.*) but if this Accurate Author had examin'd the viii c. which precedes the Synodical Epiſtle, he wou'd have found Reaſon to conclude that the Biſhops look'd out, or choſe the Perſon themſelves, propos'd him in order to a Teſtimonial, and then ordain'd him. In this Place alſo, he might have ſeen *Maximus* depos'd by the Biſhops only. The 1. Can. of the 4. Council of Carthage 394 (he means I ſuppoſe 398) *ſays*; *A Biſhop is to be ordain'd by the Conſent of all the Clergy and People.* Now the Words of the Canon run thus ——: *If he be found well inſtructed in all theſe Points, he may be ordain'd Biſhop with the Conſent of the Clergy and Laity, in the Aſſembly of Biſhops by the AUTHORITY and in the Preſence of the Metropolitan.* By this Time the Reader will conclude, that theſe two Learned Writers had ſtrong Reaſons indeed for ſaying, *It is plain then, that the Biſhops themſelves, did not for ſeveral Centuries imagine, that the Right of making Biſhops, was appropriated by God to them* ——. From the 54 Can. of the *African Code* it is plain that the Biſhops, not the People, choſe, and then propos'd the Perſon to the People, in order to hear, if they had any Objections againſt him; nay, the Nature of the

Thing

Thing ſhews it; for if they had elected, a Majority muſt carry it, and there was no Room for Objections when the Election was over; on the contrary, the Perſon was Nam'd and Propos'd to the People, conſequently not known to them, or choſen by them; and it was the ſame Thing, whether two Men, or all the People objected againſt him; for if theſe two appear'd ſuch Evidence as ought to be admitted, their Allegations were examin'd, and the Perſon to be ordain'd, was either ordain'd or rejected, according as the Tryal ended.

What Mr. *D.* alledges from Dr. *Barrow*, exactly agrees with my Notion. He ſays, that Biſhops were uſually elected by the People, he alſo ſays, that the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Men (who were Authorized by the Apoſtles to act with Power and in their ſtead) did in the Churches founded by them, conſtitute Biſhops, ſuch as Divine Inſpiration, or their Grace of Diſcretion did guide them to, and this, not without the Conſent of the People, what follows, ſhews, that the People's Teſtimony was requir'd, not their Authority. He cites St. *Cyprian* (I have conſider'd the Places before) He cites Canons, and ſays of them —, *There is no expreſs mention concerning the Intereſt of the Clergy and People, in the Election of the Biſhops; but theſe Things are only paſs'd over, as Precedaneous to the Conſtitution or Ordination, about which, only the Fathers intend to preſcribe, ſuppoſing the Election to precede according to former uſual Practice —. The People did generally elect their Biſhops*, &c. Now what is to be infer'd from all this? That this Practice was general, not Conſtant and Univerſal; that it was *Precedaneous to Conſtitution*, that it was Teſtificatory, not Authoritative, not Conſtitutive: Now who has deny'd this?

Mr. *D.* deals with Dr. *Barrow*, as with every Author he cites; but if any Perſon will be guided by his Teſtimony in this Affair, they will find him calling the Clergy the People's Superiors (p. 78.) from St. *Cyprian*; and Attributing the Election to the Paſtors (146) (which indeed is the Voice of many Antient Canons) He complains in the Words of *Gregory Nazianz*, that Elections are corrupt, ought to be reform'd and put into the Hands of the beſt; (148) ſhews them to be uncertain and Humane (which is true of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. as well as of *Rome*, in which he only Inſtances) (p. 150.) he ſays (from Can. 6. of the Council of *Nice* referring to the 34 Apoſt. Can. inter-

interpretred by the 19 Can. of *Antioch*,) that the Deſignation of Biſhops is by Biſhops; that they are not ſubject to any Judgment but that of Chriſt (p. 320 from the Council of *Carthage* in St. *Cyprian*) that their Conſecration or Ordination, conferrs on them their Character and Authority; (p. 328.) that Depoſitions belong to the Clergy in Synod; and that they are very irregular in the People (p. 341, and 347.)

Arch Biſhop *Cranmer's* Evidence is unexceptionable; Why ſo? It is certain the MS, Mr. *D.* means, was made in the Popiſh Times, in *Henry* the VIII's Time; for *Cranmer* ſubmits himſelf and his Judgment to the King, and the King made Animadverſions upon it, which is not very likely to be true of King *Edward*, who was not Nine Years Old (unleſs perhaps, he was as forward as Biſhop *Burnet* ſays, Queen *Elizabeth* was, who writ Letters in *Italian*, before ſhe was four Years Old) Again, Dr. *Lee* Arch Biſhop of *York*, who ſubſcrib'd the Anſwer, died 1544. three Years or thereabouts, before King *Edward*'s Acceſſion. This MS. is alſo without Date, and the Opinion deliver'd in it is contradicted by the Arch Biſhop's after Thoughts: See the Preface to the Form of Ordination in King *Edward*'s Liturgy, and *Cranmer*'s Catechiſm publiſh'd in the firſt Year of *Edward* the VI, 1548. Dr. *Burnet* thus obſerves upon this Unexceptionable Evidence.

In Cranmer's *Papers, ſome ſingular Opinions of his about the Nature of Eccleſiaſtical Offices occurr; but as they are deliver'd by him with all poſſible Modeſty, ſo they were not eſtabliſh'd as the Doctrine of the Church; but lay'd aſide as particular Conceits of his own. And it ſeems, that afterwards he chang'd his Opinion; for he ſubſcrib'd the Book, that was ſoon after ſet forth, which is directly contrary to thoſe Opinions ſet down in this Paper.* An unexceptionable Evidence indeed! Thus clear ſays Mr. *D.* does this Truth ſtand in Antiquity. We now come round again to inſtances of Elections, which ſhall all of them be acknowledg'd; for the Queſtion betwixt us is not, *whether there were Elections or not; but whether they were Prudential and Expedient; or Conſtitutive and Neceſſary*, which I deny; and in this long Piece he never once Attempts to prove: The People (ſays *Socrates* Lib. 4. c. 30. p. 203) cry'd out, that *Ambroſe* (a) was worthy of the Bi-

(a) *If this Election of* Ambroſe *was Conſtitutive, it muſt follow, that* Ambroſe *was a Biſhop before he was a Chriſtian; for when they choſe him he was not Baptis'd.*

ſhop-

ſhoprick, and requeſted, that he might [χειροτονηθῆναι] be ordain'd, ſuch was their Authority! A Requeſt. The Place [Lib. 5. 15.] he refers to about *Flavian*, is an Account, not of a Biſhop conſtituted, but of one who recover'd his See. *Syneſius was choſen by the People*, let it be ſo. *But this ſame* Syneſius *in his Letter to* Theophilus *gives a Remarkable Inſtance of the Incroachment of the Clergy, on the Rights of the People, to chooſe their own Miniſters, and the Zeal of a poor little People in withſtanding their Impoſitions.* The laſt Words of *Syneſius*'s Account to *Theophilus* are theſe; he tells him, that the People of *Palebiſcus* and *Hydrax*, *wou'd have no Body but* Paul *of* Erythra, *inſinuating, that tho' the Inhabitants of thoſe Villages were ready to obey, if he wou'd abſolutely impoſe a Biſhop upon them, yet it was not convenient to do it*; this then is an Inſtance, that the People were Rebellious, and *Theophilus* the Biſhop was tender, that he thought not fit to exerciſe his Power, where it would meet with ſo much Reluctance.

Siſinnius, *ſays Mr.* D. *was choſen Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *by the Majority of the People*: But *Socrates* (whom he unfortunately cites, and as tho' he was Studious of being confuted, puts the Greek in his Margin) tells us, all the People [ἐπόθει] deſir'd *Siſinnius* might be made their Biſhop. Again the Laity [Lib. 7. c. xxvi.] [πόθον εἶχον] deſir'd him for his great Piety and Charity. And then he adds: The great Affection [σπουδή] of the People prevail'd. The Caſe of *Proclus* and *Dalmatius* is alſo ſo far from anſwering Mr. *D*'s End, that *Proclus* is by *Socrates* and *Valeſius* deem'd the proper Biſhop, and the People's Act cenſur'd as Rebellious. See *Socrates*, Lib. 7. c. xxviii. and *Valeſius* upon him.

Many more Inſtances of this Kind, he ſays, he may bring; *but* Pamelius's *Authority, a Learned Man and an Adverſary ſhall ſave him the Trouble*; Pamelius *own's the Antient Cuſtom of Elections*; Pray who ever deny'd it?

After this long Ramble, Mr. *D.* is at leiſure to attend what I have advanc'd in Oppoſition to his Notion. *He accuſes me firſt of imperfectly citing St.* Clemens Romanus; but to this I anſwer, the Paſſage was fairly cited, the Quotation imply'd, an undeniable Conſequence on my ſide; and they who were conſtituted Miniſters of thoſe who ſhou'd believe, muſt either be conſtituted without the Election of their People, or a Heathen People may conſtitute a Chriſtian Miniſtry; but what have I omitted? Nothing that will do Mr. *D.* any

Service

Service, nay what is really prejudicial. St. *Clement* tells us, (and every Body knows it) *that* Moſes's *Propoſal about the Budding Rod, was not made to the People, becauſe they had a Right, but was an Act of Diſcretion, and Expedience: So likewiſe the Apoſtles*, &c. to prevent Diviſion, διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν, *conſtituted the aforeſaid Perſons.* Is it not clear then, what Liberty they gave the People? *Wherefore then, we can't think, that thoſe may juſtly be thrown out of their Miniſtry, who were conſtituted by the Apoſtles, or other eminent Men, with the good liking of the People.* The laſt Words are all Mr. *D.* inſiſts upon, and they prove nothing, except good liking muſt be Authority. St. *Cyprian* ſaid *the Church was founded upon the Biſhops*; the College of Presbyters and Deacons at *Rome* told him, *it was his Modeſty that he did not, or wou'd not govern alone*; I therefore concluded it was probable the Biſhops conſtituted the Miniſtry; I concluded the ſame from the Council of *Carthage. The Judgment or Mind of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt ſending his Apoſtles, and granting to them alone, the Power given him by his Father, is manifeſt. Them we ſucceed, governing the Church of Chriſt by the SAME POWER, and baptizing the Faithfull; therefore the Heretics, who have no Power out of the Church, nor are a Church of Chriſt, can baptize no Man with Chriſt's Baptiſm.* This plainly concludes for me in the Queſtion before us, *whether the People have any Divine, original Power or not*; It ſays, the Apoſtles *alone* had it, and that the Biſhops poſſeſs'd the *ſame Power* then, which the Apoſtles had before. All Mr. *D. has to ſay here, is, that according to this Rule*, Novatian's *Baptiſm was invalid, of Conſequence his Orders were invalid alſo, and therefore we have no Succeſſion, for we muſt derive from him.* This is drawing the Reader's Attention from the Point, and entering upon an Argument, which has nothing to do in this Place. I Promiſe to give a full Anſwer to it, as it comes in Courſe.

After I had produc'd enough to confront Mr. *D.* and more than was neceſſary; for to invalidate his Arguments, was all I was oblig'd to, not to advance any thing my ſelf) I hinted the Names only of ſome Authors, who afford pregnant Proof in this Caſe. *Here he ſays, if theſe Authors had been for my Purpoſe, I ſhou'd have lay'd them out to the greateſt Advantage.* To this I only Anſwer, that I never propos'd to write upon this Subject further than to refute him. I have and I ſhall ſhew his Pretences to be empty and impertinent; and

whoever thinks fit, from other Citations, to ſupport his Cauſe, I'll engage to ſhew, that they ſignify no more than thoſe Mr. *D.* has already alledg'd.

He now enters upon the Facts, *and wonders how I can mention the firſt without bluſhing*; I thank God I have nothing to bluſh for, except the Ignorance of my Adverſary. I had ſaid, that *Clement* left his Biſhoprick to *Euariſtus*, and conſtituted him without the People. Mr. *D.* ſays, that by [left] *The Hiſtorian meant no more than, that by Clements Death the Biſhoprick became vacant, and ſo* Euariſtus *was choſen into it.* The Hiſtorian cou'd not have us'd any Word more likely to have prevented this Miſtake. Παραδίδωμι is the Word; and Mr. *D.* very innocently places the Citation in the Margin. It ſignifies to yield up, to deliver, and that very often in order to Succeſſion and Propagation expreſly. Perhaps Mr. *D.* ſeeing [relinquens] in the Verſion never troubled himſelf with the Greek. This Way was not New; for *Euſebius* Report's the ſame of *Anencletus* [p. 70] that *Linus* gave up his Biſhoprick to him; nor was it the Practice of the moſt early Times only, but what we find to have obtain'd afterwards, and continu'd down to the Days of St. *Athanaſius* at leaſt; for *Alexander* deſign'd to have deliver'd his Epiſcopate to him, but was prevented by his Flight.

In the Caſe of *Gregory, Thaumaturgus* he ſays, *I don't diſtinguiſh between Election and Conſecration.* I ſay, there was no Election, the Conſtitution was by *Phœdimus* alone, and if our Author pleaſes he may conſult the Learned Dr. *Cave*'s Life of *Gregory*, which will alſo direct him to others. Du Pin *ſays ordain'd*; *but that he means conſecrated only by it*, is more than Mr. *D.* will ever prove, or, if it was prov'd, more than that Learned Perſon can juſtify. Nay, *Du Pin* in many Places, gives every ſenſible Man juſt Reaſon to conclude, that he had no ſuch Opinion as Mr. *D.* that the People's Election is Neceſſary and Conſtitutive, that a Biſhop thus elected is as much one as ever he can be, &c.

He proceeds to the 36th Can. of thoſe commonly call'd Apoſtolical. This Canon runs thus: *If any Biſhop ordain'd, don't accept the Miniſtry and Care of the People committed to him, let him be ſuſpended till he do accept it*; (ſo alſo a Prieſt or Deacon) *but if he goes thither and is not receiv'd, not through his own Willfullneſs, but the Wickedneſs of the People, let him remain Biſhop, and let the Clergy of the City be ſuſpended, becauſe they have not*

been

been Correctors or Disciplíners of so Refractory a People. From this Canon it is plain, that Bishops were made for the People, tho' Absent, and therefore not electing, and that it was accounted a great Crime in the Clergy to suffer the People to have so little Knowledge, or Deference, as not to submit to such a Constitution. Mr. *D.* says, there is no such Thing in the 36th Canon, as I alledge. Here he shews a Want of Candour; for in the English Translation this Canon is not the 36, but the 37; & a want of reading; for in the Original Greek it is the 36, as I have cited it. The Case of the Alexandrian Bishops is mightily admir'd by Mr. *D.* He says, *I was very unfortunate in my Choice; for* Athanasius *according to* Du Pin, *was elected,* &c. Any Person may see, that I confin'd my Instance to the earlier Times of this Church, for I own'd an Election, still denying it to be necessary and constitutive in the latter Days. To confute this, he gives one Instance in the 4th Century. To this he adds one a little higher, *namely* Achillas, *from* Du Pin *supported by* Socrates (Lib. 3. c. 7. he says, but indeed Lib. 1. c. 5. p. 8.) Now *Socrates* only says, *Achillas, entred upon the Bishoprick of* Alexandria *after* Peter's *Martyrdom.* The next Thing we hear, is, *that* Evagrius *and* Valesius, *are mightily on his Side.* Euagrius *says, that the* Alexandrians *petition'd Zeno, that they might propose,* [προβάλλεσθαι] *present, or recommend* (Evagr. p. 343. Lib. 3. c. 12.) *who they pleas'd for their Bishop. Upon this, the Emperor made a Law, that they shou'd.* Upon these Words *Valesius* does not write only as Mr. *D.* says, but thus: *It is plain then, that the Election of Bishops was taken from the Clergy and and People of* Alexandria; *we deny not, that this was done contrary to the Ecclesiastical Laws* [humane Constitutions] *and by Force: YET THE* ROMAN *PRINCES ARE NOT TO BE blam'd for challenging that Right, after the Death of* Proterius; *because* Alexandria *well enough inclin'd to Tumults of it self, often rais'd great Commotions upon such Occasions.* Thus a Law was thought Necessary by the Emperor and an humble Petition preferred by the People. The Thing they ask'd had been *customary,* but not *necessary.* The Emperor took it away with an *high Hand,* but not *without a Cause.* The Election was not pretended as *Essential,* nor the Right of those, who had it not, *question'd.* What Mr. *D.* says of Tumults in Elections, and Bishop *Pearson*'s Opinion *&c.* is all admitted; Elections there certainly were, I've told him

more than once in my Conſiderations, that I own it. All then that he has to prove, is the Power and Authority of them.

To oblige Mr. *D.* who is now in a very Critical Humour, we muſt conſider the Senſe of Suffragium. *Biſhops were choſe by the People's Suffrage*; Suffragium *ſignifies an Authoritative Act*; *therefore Biſhops were choſe by the People's Authority*. If Arguments were to be drawn from the Senſe of Words, without regard to plain Facts and Determinations, there wou'd be no End of Diſputing. It wou'd be ſufficient to ſay, that as the People's Election was no Authoritative Act, ſo the Word *Suffragium* when apply'd to it, cannot have an Authoritative Senſe. Let it ſignify what it will, it can't mean ſuch an Election as is Conſtitutive and Eſſential; I might produce Authorities from our beſt Claſſicks the Standard of the *Roman* Eloquence, where it is only *Favour*, *Conſent*, *Teſtimony*, &c. but this might perhaps be call'd an Impertinence. Tho' St. *Cyprian* was a Polite Man, for his Age and Country, he is not to be tryed at this Bar. The Paſſages cited by Mr. *D.* from this Author are by no means proper to determine this Matter. For when I alledge, that *Suffragium* has not an Authoritative Senſe, as us'd by St. *Cyprian* in ſpeaking of the People's Election, it is begging the Queſtion to produce the Places concerning the People's Election. But ſays he, it is *contradiſtinguiſh'd from Teſtimony*; It is ſo, but not ſo contradiſtinguiſh'd, as, that becauſe it does not mean Teſtimony, it muſt therefore mean Authority, which is the Thing he ſhou'd prove. He ſays my Inſtances conclude againſt me; for the Suffragium *prædicationis* in *David*'s Caſe, ſhew'd, the People *preferr'd* David *before* Saul, *and was a Preſage of their future Suffrage*. (What future Suffrage?) admit this: Did this Suffrage ſtamp his Actions, and denominate them good and brave; Did it give him, what is declar'd he deſery'd? Was it any more than the Expreſſion of their Favour, and a Teſtimony given to his brave Deeds? The other Inſtance of mine is more cunningly abus'd. St. *Cyprian* ſays, that the *Jews* ask'd the Crucifixion of our Lord with violent and pertinacious Suffrages. Mr. *D.* propoſes to prove, that *ſuffragiis ſignifies Demand, or ſomething more than a bare Petition*; for the Proof of this, he refers to the Fact. St. *John* ſays no more, than, that the People were Tumultuous [ἐκραύγασαν] St. *Luke* ſays the ſame, and adds

[and

[αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σαυρωθῆναι] petitioning, that he might be crucify'd; St. *Matthew* alſo uſes the ſame Word. St. *Mark* ſays, [πεισκοπέρως ἐχαρίζαν] and yet no Petition, all Authority forſooth; but the *Jews were Taunting and Sawcy*; Petitioners have been ſo ſince their Times and before. Is Mr. *D.* in earneſt, that the *Jews* had a a Right to demand a Rebell and a Murderer to be releas'd or a Juſt Perſon to be condemn'd? They had juſt ſo much to expect, as the People wou'd have, if they ſhou'd elect a Deiſt and an Adulterer for a Biſhop, they ought to be rejected with Indignation; and the Roman Governour if he had done his Duty, ſhou'd have chaſtiz'd their Inſolence, and not yeilded to their Clamour. *The Suffragium implies a Preference of one Thing to another*; ſo does a *Volition* tho' never expreſs'd or known; it carries in it a choice and full Conſent, but is not therefore Authoritative; *yea a Poſtulation and Demand*; but yet neither Power nor Right. *Mr.* H. Cavills *and is Partial.* He has ſaid nothing, but what the great *Euſebius* affirm'd ſeveral hundred Years ago (Lib. 3. c. 7. p. 65.) namely the People (ἱκέτευσεν τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀρθῆναι) beſought, that the Prince of Life ſhou'd be taken off; He will ſcarce ſtand by this Reaſoning, or allow the violent pertinacious Suffrages of his People, to have no more Effect than thoſe mention'd by St. *Cyprian*, the Senſe of the People thus expreſs'd may prevail, but the Point he ſhou'd prove is, that it ought to prevail. We will readily grant what he can never prove, that Suffragium always implies an Election; but that this Election is Conſtitutive and Eſſential he ſhou'd have ſhewn.

Mr. *D.* proceeds to juſtify himſelf in the Caſe of *Baſilides* and *Martialis*. I charg'd Mr. *D.* with citing St. *Cyprian* in a ſcandalous Manner; I ſtill affirm it. *He ſays I might ſee by the Breaks, that it was not put upon the Reader, for one continu'd Sentence:* It is a Miſtake; for there are only two Breaks, whereas there ought to have been four; and, as I before ſaid, thoſe Words, which are not for his Purpoſe, are left out, and what is firſt in St. *Cyprian*, is plac'd the laſt in his Citation; *but I have been guilty of the ſame Fault.* It is ſtrange Mr. *D.* cou'd be ſo harden'd as to affirm this; and I appeal to all proper Judges, whether it is ſo or not; but ſuppoſe it was ſo, does my Guilt prove his Innocence? Mr. *D.* has reſolv'd to clear himſelf, or rather to make my Accuſation as ſtrong as poſſible; for in

his

his Reply he has Tranſcrib'd and Tranſlated, that tolerably well, which in his Sermon is ſo partially cited. He that examines both, will ſcarce be able to believe, that Mr. *D.* the Preacher, and Mr. *D.* the Replyer are the ſame Perſon, except by the End of this long Citation which is indeed of the ſame Stamp with his partial Way in the Sermon; for he has broke off in the midſt of a Sentence, without any Notice to his Reader, and for a Reaſon eaſy to be imagin'd. This Citation then is to *prove, that the People have Authority to chooſe their own Miniſters.* On the other Hand, I affirm, that it ſays nothing of Authority, whatever it does of Election, and that it is wrote concerning Terms of Communion.

In the firſt Paragraph, St *Cyprian* ſays, *that the Law of God precludes a wicked Prieſt from Succeſs in the Execution of his Office; that the Conſideration of that Law, is the Reaſon of Ordaining in the Preſence of the People; that what Part or Share ſoever the People have in this Affair,* (a) *they are not fondly to think themſelves guiltleſs, if they Communicate and Concurr with an Illegitimate and Prophane Miniſter.* (b) *The Prophet* Hoſea *ſays, their Sacrifices ſhall be as the Bread of Lamentation, all who eat thereof ſhall be defil'd. Thus we find, when* Corah *and his Accomplices had engag'd in uſurping a Prieſtly Power not belonging to them, God commanded the People to have no Communion with them.* (c) *Upon this Account the People, if obedient to the Divine Commands, and living in the Fear of God, ſhou'd ſeparate themſelves from a wicked Biſhop, and not mix in Communion with a Sacrilegious Prieſt; for they have the Power of chooſing worthy Prieſts and refuſing the unworthy. This we ſee deriv'd* (d) *from Divine Authority, that the Prieſt ſhou'd be choſen in the Preſence of the People, and ſhou'd be approv'd fit and worthy by the publick Judgment and Teſtimony. Thus the Lord commanded* Moſes, *take* Aaron *thy Brother; God commands the Prieſt to be conſtituted before all the Congregation, by this, inſtructing us, that the Ordination of Miniſters ſhou'd always be with the Knowledge of the People, that ſo the People being preſent, the Crimes of*

(a) *Mr.* D's *Citation in his Sermon begins with theſe Words.*

(b) *In his Sermon, he omits all that follows till you come to theſe Words* [*for which Reaſon &c.*]

(c) *Here he begins again.*

(d) *All that follows, he omits till you come to theſe Words* [*that this was to be kept as a Divine Tradition, &c.*]

the Bad, and the Merits of the Good may be proclaim'd, and that the Ordination may be Juſt and Good, which hath been examin'd by the Judgment and Suffrage of all. The Apoſtles follow'd this Divine Precept in the Conſtitution of an Apoſtle, &c. and this was therefore done with ſo much Diligence and Caution in an Aſſembly of the People, that no unworthy Perſon ſhou'd ſteal into the Miniſtry; for ſometimes unworthy Perſons have been ordain'd, not according to the Will of God, but Humane Preſumption, and thoſe Things are diſpleaſing to God, which come not from a juſt and lawful Ordination; (a) for this Reaſon therefore, it is diligently to be obſerv'd (as it is almoſt every where) from Divine Tradition and Apoſtolical Obſervation, THAT for the due celebrating Ordinations, all the Neighbouring Biſhops of the ſame Province, ſhou'd come to the People, for whom a Biſhop is to be ordain'd, and that a Biſhop be choſen in the Preſence of the People, who are beſt acquainted with the Lives of each Perſon, and throughly know the Conduct of every one; which Thing we ſee, was done in the Caſe of Sabinus, *the Biſhoprick was given him, and he was ordain'd in the Room of* Baſilides *by the Suffrage of the whole Fraternity, and the Judgment of the Biſhops, Abſent and Preſent: Nor may this compleat Ordination be annull'd* (here Mr. *D.* concludes, but I proceed) *by* Baſilides's *Journey to* Rome *after his Conviction and Confeſſion, and his fraudulently ſoliciting our Collegue* Stephen, *who lives at a great Diſtance, and is unacquainted with the Matter of Fact, and the conceal'd Truth, to be unjuſtly reſtor'd to that Biſhoprick from which he was juſtly depos'd.* After this long Citation (with which I find no great Fault, except in ſome Grammatical Caſes, which Mr. *D.* never minded) he appeals to his Reader *for the Injuſtice of my Charge.* I am indeed inclin'd to free him from every Imputation, and therefore do acknowledge, that tho' in his Sermon this Paſſage was ſcandalouſly us'd, in this Reply he is pretty fair. It was partial in many Places; it is only ſo in one now: it was mangled and tranſpos'd, it is now in due Order, and almoſt entire. It is tolerably well ſince he publiſh'd his Reply, but we can't with all our Charity inferr, that therefore it was ſo before. This Citation fails Mr. *D.* in the main Point, as it attributed

(a) *Here he begins again, only he places theſe Words* [de univerſæ fraternitatis ſuffragio] *which ſhould follow at ſome Diſtance before this Paſſage.*

the

the Election at Ordinations to the Biſhops: Thus he ſpeaks of himſelf and his Collegues [*non niſi immaculatos & integros Antiſtites eligere debemus*] and again, [*ut ſacerdos plebe præſente ſub omnium oculis deligatur*] Mr. *D.* ſays from this Citation, that *Martialis* and *Baſilides* had *been cenſur'd by the Clergy and People of* Spain. *I ſaid*, by a Synod; *But where, and by what Synod?* From this very Epiſtle it is very probable that, by the provincial Synod of the Place *Felix* and *Sabinus* were conſtituted, *Martialis* and *Baſilides* depos'd. Conſider the Epiſtle St. *Cyprian* ſays their Ordination was (*juré perfectam*;) before that he ſays, in order to its being ſo, the Biſhops of the Province were to meet, *&c.* I will ſuppoſe Mr. *D.* knew ſo much of the depoſing Power (a) as, that the Fathers of the Church aſcrib'd it to Synods, and particularly St. *Cyprian*. If *this was done Synodically, what need for the Opinion of an* African *Council?* The Perſons cenſur'd not acquieſcing in the Determination, and having by Fraud got the Biſhop of *Rome* on their Side, it became thoſe who had juſtly come into Meaſures againſt them, to ſeek for Comfort and Council. Again, *If a Synod of Biſhops alone had done theſe Things, what need had the* African *Council to ſay, Let not the People flatter themſelves*, &c. If the People had done them, there wou'd have been no Occaſion of ſpeaking to them thus: They muſt have been ſelf condemn'd to communicate with thoſe they depos'd. On the other Hand, they might not think themſelves greatly concern'd to obſerve the Synodical Decree, when the *Roman* Biſhop had in effect reſcinded it; it therefore became the Council to tell them, that they were deeply engag'd, that they in general had the beſt Knowledge of Men's Characters, that they, in conſtituting Miniſters were examin'd to their Reputation, that they in depoſing them were ſometimes Accuſers, but always Witneſſes of their Conviction, that therefore the communicating with ſuch Wretches, however they might flatter themſelves wou'd greatly affect them. But Mr. *D.* thinks it a great *Piece of Conſideration, for a Synod to write to one Man*: How does it appear, that a Synod wrote to one Man? Were not Synods at ſtated Times in *Africa* twice in a Year? Does not the E-

(a) *Nic. Syn.* 1. *Can.* 5. *Ant. Syn.* 15. *Can. Ap. Conſtit.* 8. 28. *&c.*

piſtle

piſtle of the Synod ſay, that the Letter from *Africa* was written [*ad nos*] to us, who were met together? beſides St. *Cyprian* was a *Metropolitan*, and therefore the Spaniſh-Synod might write to him, either as preſiding over the Council, or as the only Perſon, who cou'd convene it, if not ſitting. Nor might they think it below them to ask Advice, when likely to meet with ſo powerful an Oppoſition as that of Pope *Stephen*, eſpecially when they had an Opportunity of asking it of ſo great a Man as St. *Cyprian*, and one ſo remarkably oppoſite to Pope *Stephen*; this however, is not Mr. *D*'s Opinion. It is a Pity he had not conſider'd St. *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles better, and acquainted himſelf with the Way in which the Churches correſponded in thoſe Days. What I ſaid, that this Epiſtle is chiefly concerning Communion, I ſtill think to be true, and doubt not but every Reader will be of the ſame Opinion, who obſerves; that the Texts cited by St. *Cyprian* in the firſt Paragraph all referr to ſome Fault or Defect, which hinder'd Biſhops from officiating rightly, who had an unqueſtionable Conſtitution; that the chief Care in the ſecond Paragraph is taken of Contagion by communicating; and that the Queſtion in the Letter anſwer'd is this, whether ſuppoſing Pope *Stephen* cou'd reſcind the Proceedings, the People might lawfully communicate with Idolatrous and Apoſtate Biſhops.

After all this Struggle for an Election, which Election is a Conſtitution, as good without as with Conſecration he tells us that he knows no one, *who affirms, that their Teſtimony is neceſſary abſolutely; but that the People give their Suffrage or Conſent is according to Rule*; for ſome (*a*) Body or other ſays ſome where, that a Biſhop muſt not be impos'd upon the People againſt their Will. But here we muſt not believe him in Earneſt, for he quickly *tells us this Election is neceſſary*. I'll not trouble my Reader with any Obſervations upon his Anſwer to my two Propoſals, only he may take Notice, that where I deſire him to ſhew me any Conſtitution or Depoſition perform'd by the People, he In-

(a) *This is one of the Decrees of Pope* Celeſtine *made in the fifth Century. it runs thus*: Nullis ~~Invitis~~ detur Epiſcopus. Cleri plebis et ordinis conſenſus, deſiderium requiratur. *The very Canon ſuppoſes what Mr.* D. *ſhould deny, and when interpreted in the greateſt Latitude, will do him no Service.*

ſtance's in ſeveral Elections, which is begging the Queſtion; for I deny, and he has no where prov'd Election to be Conſtitution, nay has but juſt now own'd that it is not.

In the Inſtances of Depoſition, he ſays, *Martialis* and *Baſilides* were depos'd by the People; this I have fully anſwer'd already. The Authorities from *Platina* concerning the Roman People, ſignify nothing. They relate not to the Conſtitution of a Biſhop but the Poſſeſſion of his See, and are by *Platina* condemn'd as Acts of Sedition and Violence: *Can I ſhew a Biſhop ſet over a People without their Conſent?* I've already ſpoke of many, and told him, that the 37 Apoſtolical Canon is a Proviſion in ſuch a Caſe, but this is nothing to the Purpoſe; if there had never been a Debate without lighting up Candles, wou'd it have follow'd, that they are Neceſſary and Eſſential to a Debate? *Can I prove Conſecration neceſſary? Biſhop Cranmer did not think it ſo.* He retracted his Opinion, and ſo I have at leaſt as, good a Right to his Authority as Mr. *D.* but if he had perſiſted in it, I wou'd rather chooſe the Authority of Scripture and Antiquity than his. We find it the Manner of ſetting any Thing apart to God, all along in the Old Teſtament; from which the Apoſtles took it in the New, and conſtantly us'd it in the Deſignation of Miniſters. When the Holy Ghoſt ſaid (*Acts* 13.) ἀφορίσατε ſeparate or ſet apart, the Prophets and Teachers took it for a Command to lay Hands upon *Barnabas* and *Paul.* St. *Paul* admoniſhes *Timothy* to ſtir up the Gift of God, that was in him by putting on of his Hands, and not to lay Hands ſuddenly on any Man; in the Former, making Impoſition of Hands the Inſtrument of conveying to him the Miniſterial Power; and in the Latter ordering him to ſet apart others by it; and the whole Church of God in the moſt pure and early Days always underſtood the Thing thus. This was the Ἀφορισμός, the Seperation from common Uſes to the Service of God. This alone was the neceſſary Conſtitutive Act, this was Ordination, or Conſtitution.

There is yet an Authority of St. *Cyprian's* which Mr. *D.* has perverted. St. *Cyprian* writes to *Stephen* of *Rome* to ſend to the People of *Arles* in *France*, *to elect, that is, to conſtitute and ordain a Biſhop* in the Room of *Marcianus* Now St. *Cyprian* never makes Election and Conſtitution the ſame Thing; in this very Epiſtle, he aſ-

ſerts,

ſerts, that the Biſhops ſhou'd take Care of the Flock, as Governours of it, and impower'd to reject and receive. That *Stephen* ſhou'd *write to his COLLEGUES in Gaul to repreſs the Pride and perverſeneſs of* Marcianus. He repreſents *Novatian* as *Repuls'd and Excommunicated by the* African *Biſhops*. He ſays the College of *Biſhops is therefore large, that they may ſuppreſs the Heretics, and compares them to ſeveral Ports, in ſome of which we may ride ſafe, tho' others are dangerous*. He lays the whole Care of Diſcipline upon the Biſhops, and ſpeaks of *Marcianus* as ſubject to their Juriſdiction. In the Words cited by Mr. *D.* after all, there is nothing that he wants. He has taken a falſe Conſtruction of the Words, for the full Power of the People; this is the literal Senſe of the Place, let Letters be directed into the Province, and to the People which are at *Arles*, by which Letters *Marcianus* being excommunicated, let another be ſubſtituted in his Place, and the Flock of Chriſt be gather'd together, which to this Day is deſpis'd, ſcatter'd, and wounded. A fond Man ſure of the People's Power to conſtitute a Miniſter, who can ſee it in theſe Words!

Having thus too minutely conſider'd, all that Mr. *D.* has alledg'd for the Queſtion, before I conclude this Head, I deſire leave by one Teſtimony, to ſhew what the Opinion of a very exact Perſon, who had no Intereſt to maintain among Chriſtians, either as a Clerk, or a Laic, was in this particular. The Perſon is *Alexander Severus*; the Teſtimony is that of *Ælius Lampridius* (Hiſtor. Auguſt. Script. *Paris* 1620. p. 130.) *And now, ſays he, we are ſpeaking of Places —, when he* [Severus] *had a Mind to make ſome Governors of Provinces or Præfects; or to appoint ſome Procurators, or Receivers, he propos'd their Names, exhorting the People, that if any one had any Thing to lay to their Charge, he wou'd prove it openly, and telling them, that if he did not, he ſhou'd ſuffer Death. He ſaid alſo, that it was a ſad Thing not to do this, in making Governors of Provinces, who had the Care of Men's Lives and Fortunes, when the Jews and Chriſtians did it in publiſhing their Names who were to be ordain'd.* He then took it for no more than a *Teſtimony, no Conſtitutive Act.* Notwithſtanding, that the Names were propos'd to the People, the Conſtitution was not theirs. A Critic of the firſt Claſs is, *Caſaubon* ſays, St. *Cyprian* is full of this, and obſerves how juſtly the Emperor joyn'd the *Jews* and Chriſtians in this Reflection, as tho' he had

read St. *Cyprian*, who *makes the Conſtitution of Miniſters before all the People, to be in Conformity with what* Moſes *did by the Command of God, and with the ſame View: Namely that one might be conſtituted without Blemiſh.*

Upon the whole then I conclude, *that the Election of the People is a precarious, inconcluſive Thing, ſomething ſhewing the Mind, Will, Deſire, Conſent, Good-liking or Requeſt of them; but deriving no Power, Authority, or Miſſion; that it has been judg'd expedient, but not neceſſary*; that it has *been us'd* but is not *Eſſential*; that it was purely owing to *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, or Permiſſion*, and whereever it is any where ſpoken of, as what ought to be had; all the Obligation is only *ſuch, as ariſes from Humane Conſtitution*. I hope I ſhall eaſily be excus'd, for not citing that great Number of Authorities of ſingle Fathers and Councils, which either expreſly, or by Implication ſupport this Aſſertion; becauſe it can only be thought my Buſineſs now to confute the Allegations of the Learned Mr. *D.* for the contrary Opinion.

This Part of my Conſiderations was concluded with ſome Reflections. I ſaid Mr. *D.* had inſiſted upon the dull Pretences of Reaſon, where that has nothing to do. Here he wou'd make his Friends believe, that *I'm oppoſing private Judgment, and bringing every one blindfolded under my Direction.* No, I'm only ſuggeſting, that before Men begin to diſpute, they ſhou'd conſider whether the Point is capable of being decided by *natural Senſe*, or *Divine Revelation*, and not to be ſo impertinent as to alledge one, where the other only can be uſeful. I'm adviſing to be *rational*, not *Diſputateous* and *Diſcrete*, rather than *Verboſe*, to bring Things under their *proper Claſſes*, and not *confound* your ſelf and the World about you. *My Expreſſions are ſevere, and yet not true*; I hope my Word will go as far as his, and therefore think it ſufficient to ſay they are true; as for the Severity of them, I no more admire or like it than he does; but really there is ſomething very irritating in confident Aſſertions, that have nothing to ſupport them.

I proceed now to the ſecond Part of his Reply, where I ſhall not call upon him to anſwer what I have ſaid, p, 33, and 34. But purſue him through his own Windings, and begin where he enters upon his Reply. Only one Obſervation I muſt make: He ſhould have gone into the Diſcuſſion of this Point:

Whether

Whether a Succeſſion in the Miniſtry is neceſſary, or not; *before he had aſſerted, that God wou'd not be at the Expence of Miracles without Neceſſity.* He has therefore begg'd the Foundation upon which this Argument proceeds. But *this Succeſſion he affirms to be impoſſible.* The firſt Reaſon he gives for this is, *that there is nothing in the Nature of it to preſerve it.* In order to prove it, *in it ſelf* impoſſible, he ſhou'd have ſhew'd ſomething in it's Nature that tended to deſtroy it. For if there is nothing in its Nature tending to deſtroy it, it wou'd be no Contradiction to ſay, that tho' in its own Nature it was not ſufficient to preſerve it ſelf, it might be preſerv'd by God. Now that it not only might, but it wou'd certainly be preſerv'd by God, is as yet plain, ſuppoſing it neceſſary, which he has not oppos'd, and ſuppoſing a Promiſe of Preſervation, which he does not diſprove. But he ſays it is *impoſſible, becauſe it has been broken*, and if it has been broken, it may be; this is begging the Queſtion, for we affirm it has not been broken; and it may be admitted, that it may be broken, and yet deny'd, that therefore it is not poſſible to be preſerv'd. *But tho' it be poſſible, it is not probable.* Now I think it probable, becauſe there is nothing eaſier to be conceiv'd, than, that an Office not ty'd to any one Family, Tribe or Nation may be deriv'd down from thoſe, who have once receiv'd it in *infinitum*; and becauſe it is not to be conceiv'd how thoſe can give, who have not receiv'd. The Biſhop of Bangor *ſays, this Succeſſiyn is impoſſible to be prov'd*: Admitting this, it may ſtill be true, and it is ſufficient that it can't be diſprov'd. We ſay that we are in Poſſeſſion of a ſucceſſive Title, and till it can be impeach'd, by all Rules of Law and Equity we are to be ſuppos'd in the Right. There may be the greateſt Reaſon imaginable to believe what we can't minutely prove. I doubt not but Mr. *D.* believ'd our Lord's Genealogy as deliver'd by the two Evangeliſts; but I aſſure my ſelf all that the Antients and Moderns have ſaid, does not free it from ſpecious Objections. If thoſe who hold by the beſt Titles were to prove directly againſt all Suggeſtions of Baſtardy, Felony, Treaſon, *&c.* I queſtion whether there wou'd appear one good Title in the World: The Citations from Mr. *Dodwell* and Mr. *Leſley* are taken from the Rights, who cites very little true, that he either can, or has Occaſion to pervert; but as their Opinions, if taken in

our

our Author's Senſe, are inconſiſtent with their other Writing's, I ſhall preſume they are unfairly cited, for if not, I'm ſure don't affect the Argument, which now turns upon reaſoning and not Authorities. Mr. *D.* now deſcends to Particulars: Suppoſing we have a Succeſſion, our *Orders muſt be deriv'd from St.* Peter *at* Rome. *Tho'* there is no neceſſity for granting this (ſee Biſhop *Stillingfleet's* Antiquities of the Britiſh Church. Arch Biſhop *Uſher* and *Spellman* upon the ſame Subject, *&c.*) let the Man have his Way. *The Papiſts deny we have Orders from them*; their Denyal is no Proof: If it was any Proof that we had no Orders from them, it wou'd alſo be Proof that Mr. *D.* had no Orders at all; for they deny one as well as the other; and we no more allow their *ipſe dixit* than he. My ſecond Reaſon againſt this, was, that the Evidence of Enemies is always held exceptionable, eſpecially when byaſs'd in the very Point, to which they give Teſtimony; this is graciouſly allow'd. My third Reaſon is, Pope *Paul* the IV. and Cardinal *Pool* will inform our Author better: Let him conſult the Legate's Diſpenſation granted at the Requeſt of the whole Nation, and extending as well to Orders as Benefices; and alſo *Saunders de Schiſmate* Lib. 2. p. 350. Here Mr *D.* has had got an Advantage he prizes more than any Argument. What Harangue is here about Popery, and how many Inſinuations againſt me! But alaſs, all is Ignorance and Prevarication. Mr. *D.* had ſaid, that the Papiſts deny our Orders, therefore we have none; I prov'd againſt the Concluſion in my firſt Anſwer to this Argument: Now ſuppoſing the Concluſion true, if the Premiſſes were ſo; in this third Reaſon I deny the Premiſſes: *The Papiſts don't deny our Orders*; I therefore ſay ſo, becauſe they *granted* a Diſpenſation, *&c.* this argues, that they held our Orders to be good in the main: Now if they were good ſo far as only to ſtand in need of a Diſpenſation (which never creates or makes any Thing but by relaxing the rigour of Law, or Canon, excuſes ſome Circumſtantial Defects) at one time, namely in King *Edward's* Days, they were good alſo in Quen *Elizabeth's*. But ſays he, if they wanted a Diſpenſation in King *Edwatd's* Days they wanted one in Queen *Elizabeth's*: So the Papiſts thought indeed, but we deny'd that they wanted it all. Our Argument is *ad hominem*

The Papiſts own our Orders good in the main, but in ſome Circumſtantials defective. We affirm this, becauſe they

they granted a Diſpenſation, which has no Place in other Caſes. This Argument then does not attempt to prove our Orders good in general, becauſe diſpens'd with, but good againſt their Denial, becauſe they have thus atteſted them.

As for deriving our Succeſſion from *Rome*, I gave Mr. *D.* as much Advantage as he pleaſed to take, and I ſhall content my ſelf with the Reputation of as good a Proteſtant, as A. Bp. *Uſher*, Mr. *Chillingſworth*, and the Aſſembly of Divines. What he adds, is very impertinent, and grounded upon an entire Miſtake.

What follows concerning *Whitaker* and *Fulk*, is all brangle, and ſadly miſunderſtood. *Whitaker* and *Fulk* renounc'd all Popiſh Orders.

Whitaker and *Fulk* ſpoke the Senſe of the Church, not their own ptivate Opinions; therefore the Church renounc'd all Popiſh [illegible]. I had ſaid, that this might be their private Opinion. *No, it was the Judgment of the Church.* It ſhall be ſo then. What did they and Dr. *Willet* ſay? *That the* Roman *Ordinal was with them of no Value, and that the Biſhops not ordain'd by that Ritual were as good as thoſe that were ordain'd by it.* Now this muſt hold good, 'till it is prov'd, that the *Roman* Ordinal is neceſſary, and that ſuppoſing a Succeſſion muſt be, it could not be deriv'd any other way, than by that Ordinal. Mr. *D.* greatly wrongs me in pretending this is my Reaſoning: *The Reformers did not value the* Roman *Ordinal, and ſpoke indecently of their Conſecration, Therefore they receiv'd their Succeſſion from the* Romaniſts; For I ſaid, that *tho' they did not value, or uſe the* Roman *Ordinal, they had Succeſſion from the* Romaniſts. Nay, it is plain from Mr. *D*'s own Account, that the Church of *England* did value Succeſſion, tho' not the Derivation of it by the *Roman* Ordinal. For if ſhe did not, what occaſion for Letters miſſive to the declared *Romiſh* Biſhops at all; or what occaſion for Letters miſſive, when they refus'd, to the formerly *Romiſh* Biſhops, but then reform'd? Any Miniſters choſen by the People, wou'd have done without Conſecration. This is Mr. *D*'s Opinion, but by no means Dr. *Whitaker*'s, &c. The Act of Parliament which Mr. *D.* means, is I ſuppoſe the 8 of Q. *Eliz.* He might alſo have told his Reader of the Clauſe of the Supplentes, *&c.* in the Queen's Patent. Let any ſober Man read them, and judge whether they are *Conſtitutive*, or *Declarative*; whether they reſpect *Inveſtiture and other Circumſtances of the legal Eſtabliſhment*, or *the very Eſſence of the Orders.* I'll truſt them without my Comment, and leave

leave Mr. *D.* and the *Romaniſt*, to call the *Engliſh* Biſhops by as many ill Names, as they can find in the Books of their foul mouth'd Anceſtors.

We now come to the third Reaſon, where Mr. *D.* ſays nothing directly againſt my Anſwer, but claps a pair of Citations upon what he had inſiſted on before, and leaves it to ſhift for it ſelf. I pretend not to argue from Biſhop *Burnet*, farther than he is conſiſtent with himſelf. As for the firſt Citation, it plainly relates to Circumſtantials, not the Subſtance; does not at all mean, that we have *broken the Succeſſion, but departed from the uſual Method, Form, Order, or Ritual of Deriving it.* What is brought to confirm this, regards only *the Synodical Conſtitutions*, &c. *not the Eſſence of either Doctrine or Diſcipline*, and never ſhews (as he ſays) or even pretends to ſhew, that we have not an *uninterrupted Succeſſion.* As to the Citation, which ſays, *that a Neceſſity can make that no Sin, which without it was a very great one, and that that can never grow up to a regular Conſtitution, which at firſt was not only quite out of all Rule, but no Conſtitution at all*; I'm for truſting to the Mercies of God, and think we may ſafely do it, whenever ſuch a Caſe happens, as he ſpeaks of, rather than pretending to obſerve God's Law, in direct Oppoſition to the literal meaning of it. The Biſhop plainly applies this laſt Paſſage to the forreign Churches, not to our own, tho' this I confeſs, makes no Alteration in the general. For if a Neceſſity can make ſuch a Proceeding valid, it will make it valid every where: But it makes a great Change in particular; for the Biſhop plainly intimates, it was not our Caſe here. *We departed from the Papal Canons and Ordinal, but not at all from the Subſtance of their Ordination.* Mr. D. does all he can to miſtake what I mean by Form, ſometimes he will have it to be underſtood *in a Metaphyſical Senſe, and ſometimes in a popular one.* Not to expoſtulate about this Perverſeneſs with him, and to leave my Notion, if poſſible, out of the Way of being miſunderſtood, I ſay, *Orders may be given validly, tho not* ✱ *all by the ſame Form, or Ritual. Thus the* Greek *Church ordains by one Ritual, and the* Roman *by another; but if the* Greek *ſhould take the* Roman, *or the* Roman *the* Greek *Ritual, both would ordain as validly, as they do now. The Papiſts ordain'd by one Ritual, and the Reformed by another; but both ordain'd truly, and tho' the Reform'd went off from the Papal Uſages, it was a Biſhop who made a Biſhop, and ſo the Succeſſion was not diſturb'd.* Mr. D. gives up his Friend *Ward.* He ſays, *he has nothing to do with his Im-*

~~probity~~

probity, ignorance or miſtakes. So far as they were for

his Purpose, they were good in his Eyes. Thus Controversies in Religion are manag'd like Tryals at Law, and Evidence from any Mouth good, if the other side is not diligent enough to obviate it.

But still we are not right, for tho' our Orders came from *Rome* indisputably, *Rome* was Anti-christian, and therefore could not give true Orders. Here I distinguisht upon the Word Anti-christian, and said it must either signify corrupt, or as it literally imports, so opposite to Christ, as to deny the Person we believe in, to be the Christ. This later signification will do Mr. *D.* no Service, for tho' *Rome* is greatly corrupt, it is not universally and diametrically opposite to Christ. We must therefore take it in the other Sense, *Rome* was corrupt, therefore can't give good Orders. Now if Corruption destroys the Power of giving Orders, it destroys it as well in the People, as in the Bishops. It destroy'd it as well in the Apostolical Churches, as in the Modern, for the *Ser.* tells us, that they were corrupt. If Corruption, taken in general, destroys this Power; then any Degree of it destroys it. If so, we must find a Church free from all Corruption immaculate, before we can find valid Orders, or a Power of deriving them. If the deriving Orders may consist with some Corruptions in a Church, we desire to know what are the Bounds and Limits of Corruption, where it effects this Power, and where not. These are proper Inquiries, and when answered, will naturally lead to shew the Fallacy of this Argument. I desire therefore, that the Word [Anti-christian] may be put into plain *English*, and I may have the Opportunity of arguing in Terms not ambiguous and obscure. I'm perswaded the Issue will be in favour of my self, and the Assembly of Divines; and that tho' we don't allow the *Romish* Corruptions to destroy this Power, we shall not be esteem'd Persons prejudic'd to the Papal Cause. Now these Corruptions Mr. *D.* says, *either destroy the Power, or we are Schismaticks.* To have prov'd this Point, Mr. *D.* should have made it appear, that there can be no Cause of Separation, if the Church from which we separate has a Power of giving valid Orders. Surely I can't be misunderstood here, leaving the candid Reader to discern the Prevarication us'd in this Argument, I propose, that it be considered by my Adversary, whether the *Roman* Church was so corrupt, as to have forfeited all Power of giving Orders; and whether, suppose she was not so, we must be Schismatics in departing from her. Both these Things, he as yet has but asserted, and that not only in opposition to me, but the generality of great Men, and reform'd Bodies abroad, who have lamented the want of Orders from the Papists, and endeavour'd to procure them.

Mr. *H.* says, *a virtuous Son may descend from a vicious Parent.* To this he answers, *that the Son had not either his Virtue or his*

Vice from his Parents. Granting this, he had his Humanity, by the appointment of God from him. So a good Miniſter hath not his Virtues and Graces from Men, but God; tho' the Miniſterial-Office is, (according to Mr. *D.* who is contending about the human Conveyance) convey'd by Men at the appointment of God. My Parallel then is, that a bad Miniſter may as well be the Inſtrument of conveying Power Miniſterial from God, as a bad Man may be the Means of conveying Humanity to another. But if Corruption deſeats the Conveyance, does it not defeat it in the People, as well as in the Miniſtry? Was there not a time, when the People were Idolatrous, as well as the Prieſts, and if Idolatry made a Forfeiture in one, why not in the other? An idolatrous Biſhop is ſtill a Biſhop, and as ſuch can convey Orders. The Jewiſh High-Prieſt was always eſteem'd High-Prieſt, tho' idolatrous; and our Author may remember, that *Martialis* and *Baſilides* were not accounted no Biſhops, becauſe idolatrous, but on the contrary even ſuppoſed ſuch, otherwiſe they had not been depos'd.

Mr. *D.* objected Lay-Baptiſms in the Church of *Rome*, as Interruptions of this Succeſſion. I granted that Lay-Baptiſms prov'd in the Church of *Rome*, and admitted in the Perſon of one ordain'd a Biſhop, did interrupt the Succeſſion, and yet deny'd it was interrupted, becauſe he could not prove the Fact, and only ſuppos'd it. *He banters upon this, and is offended that I repreſent him as diſcovering a great want of reading*, &c. *in it.* I'm oblig'd ſo far to do my ſelf Juſtice, as to diſcover his Ignorance. Now of thoſe who contend for a Succeſſion, there are ſome, who aſſert, and ſome who deny the Validity of Lay-Baptiſm. The Papiſts authorize Lay-Baptiſm, and yet Mr. *D.* aſſures us, that they are all in all for Succeſſion, and that no Body can be for it, without ſtrong Inclinations to *Rome*.

He might alſo have found ſtrenuous Contenders for Succeſſion among the Reform'd, who aſſert and deny the Validity of Lay-Baptiſms. He might have found in the modern Controvertiſts, Directions to Antiquity upon this Point. He might have ſeen how the Parties in theſe Diſputes ſolv'd the Difficulties objected to each other. It was a great Omiſſion to level this Argument againſt the Papiſts, without taking Notice, that they have a Rule and Practice among them, of inquiring into this very Particular, in every Perſon to be ordain'd; and don't admit any Lay-Baptiſms in the Candidates for Orders.

Mr. *D.* ſays, that tho' *Suppoſitions can't defeat Titles, yet upon theſe poſſible Defects ſuppoſ'd no Man can be ſafe, that is in Poſſeſſion of this Succeſſion.* I'll venture to ſay, he may either be ſafe, notwithſtanding theſe poſſible Defects, or he never can. For all Title is only probability, and all probability admits

admits of Defeasance; therefore, according to *D.* all Title is unsafe. I believe, that Person would be deem'd a Fool by all Men, who would like no Title, but one that is not possible to be defeated: For possibility of Defeasance is no Argument that it is defeated; and the same weighty Reason might deter a Man from eating for fear of Poison, or dwelling in the open Air, least the Sky should fall upon him: For there also are Possibilities. He concludes, *that the Supposition of this Case is enough for him, and yet in the same Pages allows, that Titles are not to be set aside by Suppositions but Facts.* Mr. *D.* says (which indeed, is not much to the purpose) that the *Aaronical* Succession was interrupted. I find Mr. *Selden* of another Opinion, and I can see nothing of it in the Scriptures. I fancy Mr. *D.* never understood the Nature of this Derivation, or Succession. I hope, if this Point is reckon'd worth any Person's Notice, who shall answer me, that he'll favour the World with Mr. *D*'s Notion of it.

The Heresies, Schisms, &c. *are a Gordian Knot not to be loos'd by my weak Efforts.* When in order to solve these Difficulties, I oppose him the Ecclesiastical Rule, he says, *I cunningly suppose the thing in Question.* Here he mistakes; for I don't affirm that, *if they maintain the Episcopal Succession in general*; but that if there were Bishops among the Hereticks, who went off from the Church, and if these Bishops pursu'd the old Method of ordaining others; then the Church deem'd the Persons so ordain'd *capable* of holding their respective Stations and Dignities in the Church. But if their Ordinations were either *Presbyterian*, or *Enthusiastic*, they did not own them. Here Mr. *D.* is as witty as a Libertine. *What, has Presbyterian Heresy more Force and Power to defeat Orders, than Episcopal,* &c. He is scarce ever volatile, except extravagant, and generally lets fly before he sees the Mark. It is not the simple Heresy of one which affects more than that of the other, but another Circumstance. Supposing one ordain'd by a Bishop, and one pretending to Orders from a Presbyter, were both *Arians.* The Church upon reconciliation can admit them both, notwithstanding they had been *Arians*; but would have refus'd the one as a Minister, because he had not Orders as he ought to have had them. Can it be a wonder to this knowing Man, that the one should be received because entirely reconcil'd, and the other not, because still persisting in an Error, or a Crime? Thus all the Raillery is nothing but a Blunder, and the poor Man was wicked, and attempted to be witty, at his own expence. Mr. *D.* proceeds to shew, that my Observation is false, that *the Church did not esteem them capable of holding their respective Stations, who had departed from the Church, and were reconcil'd.* To this Mr. *D.* objects, that when *Constantine* order'd *Arius* and his Accomplices to be admitted, *Athanasius* refus'd, saying *that it was impos-*

ſible for thoſe, who had once rejected the Faith, and were anathematiz'd to be entirely admitted again to their Degrees in the Church. Here you may obſerve (eſpecially if you collate *Athanaſius (Ed. Bened.* Tom. i. pt. i. p. 178.) with *Socrates)* that whereas I ſpoke of a *capacity* of being reſtor'd to their Degrees by reconciliation, he ſpeaks of their *being refus'd, becauſe they would not reconcile themſelves.* (2.) *Conſtantine* ſpeaks of nothing that appears, but Lay-Communion; Mr. *D.* ſays, *Athanaſius* refus'd to admit them *entirely to their Degrees in the Church.* (3.) There are no ſuch Words as [admit them entirely to their Degree in the Church] but theſe [that they *ſhould be received upon their return.*] (4.) The Word ἄνθις I preſume is a falſe reading, it ought to be ἐυθὺς. For it is not true, that it was *impoſſible* to receive returning Penitents; but it was the conſtant Diſcipline of the Primitive Church, *not to receive them immediately.* Now let Mr. *D.* and his Friends triumph in this Citation.

The Caſe of the *Melitians* is remarkably againſt Mr. *D.* For tho' the Council of *Nice* would *neither have admitted him* nor thoſe ordained by him, to their reſpective Stations in the Church, it doth not follow, but that *they might have done it, if they would.* (2.) Tho' the Council cenſured *Melitius*, as Mr. *D.* reports, *they admitted the Orders of ſome of thoſe ordain'd by him, as is plain from the ſame Page of* Socrates, *which he cites.* Does not this prove, what I aſſerted, that Hereticks and Schiſmatics were *capable* upon reconciliation, of holding their reſpective Stations. The 19 Canon of the Council of *Nice* is more to my Purpoſe than Mr. *D.* imagin'd, but ſince the illuſtration of it is ſomething critical and nice, and the Reaſon of it not Hereſy alone, but a Defect in Baptiſm; I will not inſiſt upon it, but make uſe of what he has been ſo kind as to cite for me, namely *Canon* 8. Now this Canon decrees, not that *the Novatians ſhould be ordain'd (this is a Blunder of the* Magdeburgenſes *and Mr.* D.) *but that they ſhall be received upon their Repentance by Impoſition of Hands, a Cerimony uſual in receiving Penitents, as well as ordaining Miniſters. Balſamon* and *Zonaras* exactly agree with this Account; and I only deſire the Reader to conſult the Canon and theſe Commentators upon it. (Bp. *Beveridge*'s *Synodicon.* Vol. I. p. 68 *and* 69.) Notwithſtanding that the Centuriators have been ſo favourable to Mr. *D.* in giving an Account of this Canon, and put ſome things in, which they never found in the Original, he has been forc'd upon an interpolation of his own, namely the inſerting theſe Words [*but if any of them were ordain'd by the Catholics, they ſhall remain without Ordination.*] This is fair dealing indeed! Theſe Words are no where to be met with, except in the learned Mr. *D.* I ſuppoſe. The Tranſlation of χειροθεσίαν, which I have given [after receiving Impoſition of Hands] is embrac'd, I find by *Du Pin*; but the learned Mr.

John

Johnſon's tranſlates it thus. [The Synod decrees, that they who are ordain'd ſhall continue in the Clergy.] Take the Canon under any Interpretation, but Mr. *D*'s which is inconſiſtent and interpolated, and it ſpeaks for my Aſſertion.

The Council of *Eliberis* (I inſiſt not upon his Chronology) in the 51 Canon has nothing to do with the Matter before us, and is very far from being to Mr. *D*'s Purpoſe: For it does not decree, that they ſhall not *be reſtor'd to their miniſterial Dignity, who being of the Clergy fell into Hereſy*; *but it decrees that thoſe who had fall'n into Hereſy before Ordination, ſhould not be ordain'd*; *and if any who were Heretics before Ordination had been ordain'd, that they ſhould be depos'd.*

The Authority of the Council of *Carthage*, determines nothing concerning thoſe who are ordain'd, but thoſe who ſeem to be ordained. The 2d Citation from the Ep. to *Pompeius* is very unfortunately cited, if it ſignifies any thing. For the Council condemns their Baptiſm; but this Paſſage of the Epiſtle gives a Limitation, and ſays, that thoſe who were baptiz'd in the Catholic Church, before they fell into Hereſy, are not to be baptiz'd upon their return; their Orders therefore may alſo be admitted for all we find. But ſuppoſe they were not admitted, this was only St. *Cyprian*'s Rule for *Africa*, and what he alſo obſerved with limitation. Thus in the End of that Ep. which Mr. *D.* cites, the 72 to Pope *Stephen*, he tells him his Opinion, *that thoſe who being ordain'd, had ſcandaliz'd and diſturb'd the Church, were not fit to be reſtor'd to the ſame Opportunity of doing Miſchief*; *but then in the cloſe of this Epiſtle he adds: We lay no Force upon any one, or preſcribe this Law to him*; *for as much as every Biſhop has his own free Judgment in the Government of his Church, and is to give an Account to God for it.*

I added, that where the Ordination was pretended from a Presbyter only, or an Enthuſiaſt, the Church did not own it. To this he ſays nothing pertinent, pretends not the Authority of one Father or Council, nor produces any Inſtance: He imagines he has gotten an Advantage over me, and affirms *with* Socrates *and the Centuriators, that* Iſchyras *was never in Holy Orders, therefore what I ſaid of his Orders being eſteem'd null is trifling.* It is trifling to talk with ſuch a Man. I ſaid that Orders pretended to be conferr'd by one who was Enthuſiaſtical, as *Manes*, and had no Epiſcopal Power, were eſteem'd void, and if any Perſons ſo ordain'd return'd, the Church never accounted them ordain'd. *He ſays* Manes *did not return.* The ſame I affirmed of ſuch as pretended Orders from a Presbyter only, ſuch as *Iſchyras. All his Anſwer is, that* Iſchyras *was no Presbyter.* Suppoſe this, my Propoſition is as good as ever. I've only miſtaken in my Inſtances. But it is *Socrates*, the Centuriators, and Mr. *D.* who are miſtaken. Iſchyras *had pretended Orders from* Colly

thus

thus, he was degrãded from his pretended Epiſcopate, in a Synod at Alexandria, *where* Hoſius *was preſent, and all ordained by him return'd to their former Lay-condition.* This and much more to the ſame Purpoſe, Mr. *D.* might have read in *Athanaſius*, (*Tom.* 1. *pt.* 1. *p.* 190, &c.) Nor is this the Evidence of *Athanaſius*, or of one Man only, but it is part of a *Letter from the Presbyters and Deacons of* Mareotis *to the Synod, and Part of a Certificate from the ſame Presbyters and Deacons to* Philagrius, &c. *My Confeſſion that there is a Breach of Union, muſt infer, he ſays a Breach of Succeſſion.* Here is a great deal of Puzzle about this, I will therefore ſettle it before I conſider his Authorities, &c. If Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons go off from the Church: They either ordain others in their Schiſm, or they do not. If they do not, the Schiſm is extinct with them. If they do, and they are reconcil'd to the Church, the Church either admits them to exerciſe their Functions, or not. If not, here is a ſtop put to all their Proceedings, and care is taken to rectify what has paſs'd; if ſhe does admit them, the Act of thoſe, which was not authoritative before, is now ratify'd and confirm'd.

Trophimus was a *Lapſer*, therefore this Inſtance does not concern me, unleſs Mr. *D.* can ſuppoſe that thoſe, who fell from Chriſtianity were concern'd at the ſame time in providing Miniſters for the Church. Mr. *D.* might have ſeen another Inſtance, even *Victor* in the Synodical Ep. to *Fidus*, and in the Synodical Ep. to the People of *Aſtorga*, &c. he might have found the *Lapſers* admitted to Penance, but depriv'd of Orders by the Decree of *Cornelius* and all *this* other Biſhops. The 67th Apoſtolical Canon is the only thing Mr. *D.* brings, which has any Force, and even that muſt be interpreted with great reſtrictions.

The Heretics there hinted were ſuch as had not the ſame Lord, and the ſame God with the Catholics; Perſons who had corrupted the very Fountain; and there is no doubt to be made but that others were us'd with leſs rigour, tho' theſe were cenſur'd ſo ſeverely; nay St. *Cyprian*, is of the ſame Mind with this Canon, as we have ſhew'd before, intimates that other Biſhops *did otherwiſe*. It is certain the Diſcipline of the Church was different at different times. From the reception of the Clergy into their reſpective Dignities at their return, which was very frequent; from the Depoſition of them alſo after their return, which was as frequent; and from the Canons of Councils, which determine both ways, it is certain, there was a Capacity or Power, if the Church thought fit, and this is all I contend for. All Mr. *D*'s Authorities only prove, that the Church did not admit the Capacity in ſeveral Caſes. I have no where ſaid, that the Perſons falling into Hereſy, &c. after Orders, or ordained in Hereſy, &c. were always, or muſt be admitted upon their return, but I ſaid they were capable of it. *Innocent* determin'd both ways, as Mr. *D.* may

may ſee in *Du Pin* (*Cent.* 5. *p.* 70.) Thus *Can.* 71. *of the African Code*, the *Donatiſts* are to be received; the *ſame Canon in the* Concluſion ſpeaks of a *Tranſmarine* Council, which had decreed otherwiſe. St. *Cyprian* himſelf we find receiving *Maximus* (*Ep.* 49. *p.* 93.) and when he ſpeaks againſt the *Novatians*, he makes a wide Diſtinction between them and other Heretics. Sozomen *gives Inſtances of this* (*p.* 347 *and* 349.) My Point then is clear, I ſuppoſe, that the Orders given by heretical Biſhops were ſo far good, as that if the Church pleas'd, the Heretics upon their return exercis'd their reſpective Functions, without any new Character.

All Mr. *D.* ſays, is admitted; but his Conſequence, that when a Breach of Union is, there is, a Breach of Succeſſion is not. Suppoſe what *Novatian* did, was held valid, how do his Ordinations enter the Succeſſion? If his Baptiſms were deny'd, why will Mr. *D.* ſuppoſe them admitted? If he propagated his Schiſm a long time, why muſt Mr. *D.* ſuppoſe that it mixt and incorporated with thoſe from whom he ſeparated. How can it enter into his Thoughts, that St. *Cyprian*, &c. ſo warm againſt his Aminiſtrations, ſhould ſuffer any of them to be allow'd? But after all, let Mr. *D.* take whether Side he pleaſes, that of *Cornelius*, or *Novatian*, and prove us concerned in it, otherwiſe we muſt enjoy what he can't defeat. *Novatian* may be own'd as bad as can be, his Acts invalid, and neither ſupply'd nor confirm'd; let Mr. *D.* now prove, that we *are in this Succeſſion, that we derive from him, we may be for all he knows.* It is ſcarce probable. An heretical People or Paſtors, may have given him Power, for all I know; but he'll expect I ſhou'd prove it, and with very good Reaſon.

Our Succeſſion can't be broke by Suppoſitions. *But Facts of Hereſy and Schiſm, notoriouſly prov'd and condemn'd, will break it.* Right. But where is Mr. *D*'s Proof? Novatian *and his Party was condemn'd. Therefore the Church of* England *has no Succeſſion.* A terrible *Hiatus* in this Argument! It ſhou'd have been prov'd, that we deſcended from *Novatian!* but it is much eaſier to ſuppoſe that. This had been Fact of Hereſy and Schiſm prov'd againſt us.

We have now ſeveral Pages of Citations (which I ſhall take upon Credit, becauſe imperinent) *to prove our Succeſſion broken by Simony.* I deſire it may be conſidered, that all Crimes to which the Law denounces Puniſhment, are ſuppos'd by that Law to be prov'd, and the Perſon charg'd with them to be convicted, before the Puniſhment is to take Place. In the Caſe before us then, it ſhou'd not only have been aſſerted by *Platina*, and others, that theſe Popes were guilty of ſuch Crimes, but alſo prov'd, that they were try'd, convicted, and ſentenc'd according to Law, before that Nullity which the Law declares can take Place upon them, or affect others.

How

How miſerable wou'd the Caſe of a Heathen be, who deſiring Chriſtianity, ſhou'd be initiated by one, who own'd the Miniſtry, but did not believe the Religion: Or of a Chriſtian, who receiv'd all Ordinances from a Perſon ſecretly guilty of many Crimes, which would amount to Depoſition, if he was convicted: In what a Condition wou'd theſe Perſons be, if the very doing thoſe things, which the Law had ſubjected to forfeiture, did affect them ſo, before known, or prov'd, as Mr. *D.* ſuppoſes I muſt repeat what I ſaid before upon this Matter. Tho' a Crime be never ſo great, the Criminal has a right to his Tryal, the Effect of the Law can't take Place before Proof of the Guilt, and after all, if the only Authority will connive; who has a Power to puniſh? I will ſet down what the Argument ſhould be in order to conclude, and leave it with Mr. *D*'s Friends to be prov'd. A Simoniacal Biſhop convict and condemn'd, can convey no Minſterial Power: A Biſhop convict and condemned of Simony has pretended to convey it; this has enter'd into the Succeſſion and broke it. *Ergo.* Till theſe ſeveral Propoſitions are prov'd Simony, no way affects us. The ſame might be ſaid of Hereſy, Schiſm, *&c.* *Abiathar* was as much a Traitor before, as after his Conviction, and yet as truly a Prieſt, as if he had been loyal. *Judas* was as much an Apoſtle, as if he had not been a Devil. The idolatrous Prieſts among the Jews had as good a Right to their Office, as the beſt Men that ever wore the Ephod. Why God in his Wiſdom has permitted it to be ſo, I know not, except to try whether the People will revere his Ordinances under the greateſt Diſcouragements.

Mr. *D.* gives us ſomething he had forgot in his *Sermon*; *The Caſe of Lay-deprivations.* I cou'd wiſh he had forgot it here alſo: For he appears a perfect Stranger to the Writings and Practice of thoſe who inſiſted upon it the moſt, and who have wrote againſt it the beſt. Therefore leaving him and his Friends to conſider this Point better, I ſhall proceed to that eternal Confuſion, which is to be met with in the firſt Links of the Chain. Not troubling my Reader with adjuſting Matters of Form betwixt me and my Adverſary, I affirm'd, that this Succeſſion was clear, and ſtood thus. (1.) *Linus.* (2.) *Cletus* or *Anencletus.* (3.) And *Clemens.* *The Teſtimony of* Irenæus *is commonly urg'd, ſays Mr.* D. *for this.* It runs thus: *The bleſſed Apoſtles deliver'd the Miniſtry of the Epiſcopate to* Linus. Againſt this, he brings the following Objections. He did not ſay, *they ordain'd him*, but that *they deliver'd the Miniſtry of the Epiſcopate to him.* This is the ſame thing; and *Euſebius* underſtood it ſo, for (*Lib.* 5. *c.* 6.) giving an Account of the Succeſſion of the Roman Biſhops, he cites this Paſſage from *Irenæus* (*Lib.* 3. *c.* 3. *p.* 232. *Ed. Feuard.*) I will therefore ſuppoſe he thought them ordain'd, whoſe Ordinations he had before ſpoken of, and *Linus* being one of the Order, ordain'd

dain'd as well as the reſt; (2.) *This is a Report of* Irenæus *near an hundred Years after.* Notwithſtanding this, it was eſteemed ſo well grounded, that he ventur'd to lay the Streſs of his Cauſe upon it againſt the Heretics (ſee the Place) and *Enſebius* who had all the Opportunities imaginable, is content with this Authority alone. Beſides, this ſame hundred Years Tradition might come down by one Hand excluſive, from St. *John* to *Polycarp*, and ſo to *Irenæus*. Now *Irenæus* his great Maſter *Polycarp* was at *Rome*, and had the beſt Opportunity of informing himſelf, that could be. (3.) Irenæus *does not ſay that the Apoſtle* Peter *ordain'd him, but the Apoſtles in general, as if he was in doubt and did not know who. Irenæus* will ſhew any one, that Mr. *D.* never ſaw this Paſſage in his Book: For he ſpeaks not of the Apoſtles in general, but of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and let who will ordain him, it is certain theſe Apoſtles would not have committed to him the care of the Church, if he had not been ordain'd. I will help Mr. *D.* to another Objection like the Former. *Irenæus* does not ſay that *Linus* was validly baptiz'd, or by whom, which is a main Point: For if we can't prove him a Chriſtian, how can we make him a Miniſter? To make this Matter ſtill more difficult, Mr. *D.* gives us a Sketch of a ſpurious interpolated Piece, the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions: Of the Church of *Rome*, *Linus* the Son of *Claudia*, was firſt ordain'd by *Paul*, *contrary, ſays Mr.* D. *to* Irenæus, *who affirms that the bleſſed Apoſtles deliver'd the Miniſtry to* Linus. Well then (delivering the Miniſtry) is the ſame as ordaining, otherwiſe how are theſe two contrary to one another? Is not Mr. *D.* contrary to himſelf, to make ordaining and delivering the Miniſtry the ſame Things here, and different Things a little before; but if the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions will do nothing for him, *Euſebius* will: For *Euſebius* deſtroys both theſe Evidences. A ſtrange brave Man! by one Authority, to deſtroy the Evidence of two, contrary to one another. *After the Death of* Peter *and* Paul, Linus *was firſt choſen by Lot, to the Biſhoprick of* Rome. πρῶτος κληροῦται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν: Here he diſcovers his Knowledge of Sophiſtry and his want of Grammar together. He takes an Advantage of an Homonymy κληροῦται is as often us'd, for *obtains* ſimply, as *obtains by Lot.* I could produce *Iſæus* and *Plato*, &c. For this, but omitting theſe *uncommon Books*, the LXX will afford Examples enough of this Kind. He tranſlates the Word like a Verb paſſive, whereas it is Verbum medium. *There, one ſays, the bleſſed Apoſtles deliver'd the Miniſtry to* Linus, *another, that* Paul *ordain'd* Linus *firſt; a Third, that neither is true, for after the the Martyrdom of* Peter *and* Paul, *he was choſen to the Biſhoprick by Lot. Now if he was was choſen after the Death of* Peter *and* Paul, *he could not be ordain'd by them in their life*

Time. This whole Matter is eaſily reconcil'd: St. *Paul* ordain'd *Linus* according to the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* deliver'd the publick Miniſtry to him, according to Mr. *D.* and according to *Euſebius* he was in Poſſeſſion and Exerciſe of it in *Rome* after the Death of *Peter* and *Paul*. *Mr.* H. *ſays* Linus *was firſt*; Anencletus *ſecond and* Clemens *the third*; Epiphanius, *ſays* Cletus, *not* Anencletus *or* Anacletus *was ſecond:* Yes, and herein he agrees with Mr. *H.* for *Cletus*, *Anencletus* and *Anacletus*, are only different Names of the ſame Perſon. Tertullian *ſays*, Clemens *was firſt after* Peter; he ſays nothing of firſt or laſt: *But that* Clement, *whom every body knows to have been Biſhop of* Rome, *was ordain'd by* Peter, *not plac'd in the See by him, as is ſaid of* Polycarp *at* Smyrna *by St.* John. But *Mr.* D. *ſays, if* Peter *ordain'd* Clemens, *he could not deliver the Biſhoprick to* Linus; Why not? muſt he needs give him the Biſhoprick of *Rome*, becauſe he ordain'd him? *If* Peter *ordain'd* Clemens *firſt*, Paul *could not ordain* Linus *firſt.* What could not *Paul* ordain *Linus*, becauſe *Peter* had ordain'd *Clement*? *Nor is it contrary to Dr.* Eachard, *tho'* Peter *ordain'd* Clemens, *that* Linus *ſhould ſucceed* Peter, *and* Clemens Paul; but if Peter *ordain'd* Clemens, *then he could not ordain* Linus *too, to be Biſhop of the ſame Church at the ſame Time.* It is no where ſaid that he did: Euſebius *ſays, Mr.* D. *confeſſes it difficult to ſay, who were the certain Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* Here he ſtops, but *Euſebius* proceeds; —— except thoſe whom we eaſily gather to have been ſuch by the Apoſtles naming them. Such were, as he goes on, Timothy *at* Epheſus, Titus *at* Crete —— Linus *the firſt, and* Clemens *the third Biſhop at* Rome, (*a*) The Centuriators, Mr. *D.* ſays, reckon'd this very Article of the *Succeſſion impoſſible to be* reconcil'd. The Centuriators don't ſay ſo, but [*fere nequeat*] which at leaſt wants a little of impoſſible. What Dr. *Eachard* ſays, is only his Teſtimony taken from the ſame Authors, we have before conſider'd. Biſhop *Stillingfleet*'s Character I eſteem as good as Mr. *D.* can repreſent it, that Biſhop in an (*b*) Ep. Dedic. to the *Biſhop of* London, pleads, that he wrote the Irenicum in his younger Years; that the Time when it was written, was before the Church was reeſtabliſh'd: that the Deſign of it was to gain upon Diſſenters, by overthrowing the *jus Divinum* of Presbytery, and ſhewing them that Prelacy was a lawful Government; upon theſe Accounts ſays he, my Superiors made Allowances for the

(*a*) Mr. D. might have been ſo fair as to mention, or conſider *Ruffinus* and Dr. *Barrow* upon this Point.

(*b*) Prefixt to a Ordination Sermon, preach'd *March* 5. 1684.

Scepti-

Scepticalneſs, and injudiciouſneſs of my Youth, and the Prejudices of my Education. But further, ſuppoſing this Book not retracted; What is the Intent of the Biſhop in it? not to preclude a Succeſſion of Miniſters, but a certain Form of Government. I have now run through the whole String of Mr. *D*'s Objections, tho' I might have ſav'd my ſelf the Trouble. He traces our Succeſſion from Rome *through* Novatian *and the corrupt Popes*. Now there is the greateſt Probability imaginable, that we had Biſhops in *Britain* before *Novatian*, and it is that when *Auſtin* the Monk came hither he found our Cuſtoms different from what we plainly find *Rome* had held from the Times of *Victor* and long before. Could we be polluted by that Fountain, from which we did not flow, or from that Fountain which was pure when we came from it? He regulates our Diſcipline by the Canons of *Carthage*: Could provincial Synods not made, or receiv'd by us, affect us?

After ſome Triumphs upon the vanquiſh'd Adverſaries, he ſays; *I have wrong'd him in ſaying he affirms the Succeſſion is impoſſible, becauſe it may fail; for he ſays it is impoſſible becauſe it has fail'd.* I ſuppoſe he means *a broken Chain can't be a whole one.* Now this is begging the Queſtion; I have aſſerted that the Chain is whole, and anſwer'd all his Arguments to the contrary: *He then ſays it is uncertain.* No more, ſo than any other Title, or many Things that muſt be admitted. It is a fair Probability, and the Caſe admits no more: This might have been ſaid againſt the Aaronical Succeſſion. *He owns it, and ſays, the Aaronical Succeſſion was broken.* Mr. *Selden* will not allow this, and it is plain Mr. *D.* did not underſtand the Nature of this Succeſſion. He ſuppoſed it to be deriv'd in a Line of Primogeniture and Proximity; but in the Scripture he will find it ty'd to a Family only, and not to ſuch and ſuch a Rule of Succeſſion in that Family: So that tho' it might generally paſs in the Way of Inheritance, where it did not, there was no Breach in the Succeſſion.

The Succeſſion laſtly, is Popiſh; Againſt this, what can be ſaid? This is to alarm weak Heads, and fright well meaning Men out of their Religion and their common Senſe: but Mr *D.* does not underſtand his Weapon, and pretends to give Reaſons, where it had been his Buſineſs only to be in with the Paſſions. *It is popiſh* (1.) *becauſe the Papiſts aſſert it*; this proves too much. It will from this follow, that the Scriptures are popiſh; for the Papiſts aſſert them (2) *It is the Source of all papal Errors, eſpecially their Domination and lording it over the People, their diſpenſing with the Word of God* &c. Can Mr. *D.* be in earneſt now? Can he think, that the Way and Manner of deriving their pretended Power is the Cauſe of their evil Actions, not the

Power it ſelf, of which they are poſſeſs'd? Does he not remember what he has told us from the Rights of the Chriſtian Church, *that the Election of the People continu'd in* Rome *in ſelf till* 1174, *and how many Monſters of Popes he has found out in* Platina *before that Time?* If I knew any harm in the Succeſſion, I ſhould quickly reject it; but after the moſt mature Thought, I believe it's Accuſers will be forc'd to ſay as *Pilate* did to the *Jews*: Take ye it and crucify it, for I find no Fault in it. To look up to Jeſus the great Biſhop of our Souls, who was ſent by the Father; to the Apoſtles ſent by him with a Power of ſending others: To the Martyrs and Confeſſors, their Succeſſors in Purity as well as Office; to the many corrupt and wicked Miniſters, Their Succeſſors in Office, tho' not in Purity, is a great Inducement to Paſtors with all Courage and Conſtancy, Patience and Humility, Caution and Diligence to attend upon their Cure. On the other Hand to find, that Election of the People, which was not from the Beginning, which was never conſtitutive, but purely humane, attended with ſuch Tumult and Confuſion, that the civil State could not be ſafe, while it ſtood; to behold the Inability of the People to chooſe, their Raſhneſs to depoſe or receive; how little they are under the Direction of their Paſtors; the Ambition and Bribery that often precedes, the Faction and Diviſion that generally follows it, would give a prudent Man great Uneaſineſs, and make him take care that he is ſure of the Argument, before he admits the Practice.

Before Mr. *D.* leaves the main Argument, he ſeems to have unſaid a great deal of what he had ſaid before. He ſays, *that Biſhops are to be choſen by the Church, the Faithful under the Direction of the Elderſhip,* [*the Maſters, or Principals* under their Servants] *that when thus approv'd and elected, they are to be ſolemnly, and regularly ſet apart by Faſting and Prayer according to the Examples in the Word of God, and with Impoſition of the Hands of the Presbytery,* [*tho' it can't be conceiv'd* what Virtue can drop from their Fingers; and tho' the Perſons choſen are as truly Miniſters before as after this Ceremony] *That when Miniſters are thus conſecrated, then they are the Rulers and Governors of their ſeveral Churches,* &c. [tho' Conſecration is nothing, or ſomething as good as nothing, what was us'd by the Churches in the Apoſtolical Days, and ever ſince, but cannot be prov'd neceſſary and may be let alone] it is only *a Declaration of a Fact,* ſomething that may as well be done by a common Cryer as a Miniſter, and much more ſignificantly by Words, which every body knows, than by ſuch Geſtures as are not to be underſtood without a Knowledge of Sacrifical Rites, and ſome Exactneſs in that old muſty Book the BIBLE.

My

My Reflections upon Mr. *D.* concerning the Word κλῆρος have given him a great deal of Trouble, and yet if the Reader will compare what he has said, with what I alledg'd, no Notice is taken of my Argument. As I have follow'd him through all the rest of his Mistakes, I'll attend him here, and more particularly to shew my Complaisance will prove to him from an unquestionable Authority, that I had no Occasion to do it. What was to be prov'd is, *That Ministers are call'd God's peculiar People, his* κλῆρος *distinct from the People.* Mr. *D.* says, from the Magdeburgenses *that the Ministers were therefore call'd* κληρικοι, *because they were chosen by Lot*; *and that* Eusebius *his Use of* κλῆρος and κληρόω *puts a Man upon thinking so.* The Ministers then were call'd *the* κλῆρος: For Mr. *D.* gives us the Reason of their Name, *they were chosen by Lot.* No body else but they could be call'd κλῆρος in this Respect: For tho' the Ministers were chose by Lot; and therefore call'd κλῆρος, the People were not chosen by Lot, and therefore could not be call'd so: Well then, according to Mr. *D.* the Ministers are in some Sense God's κλῆρος only. But Mr. *D.* perhaps is only against the Ministers being call'd the Portion, or κλῆρος, or Church of God, *as that excludes the People from being so at all*: For he can never be suppos'd to mean, that the People are as much God's peculiar Portion even as Ministers, as the Ministers themselves are. This would be to confound what he seems to distinguish, and to make the People Ministers as well as the Clergy. I can't tell where to find him an Adversary in this Opinion: But however, I'll observe upon what he has said. *The Appropriation of the Word* κλῆρος *to the Ministers is Popish.* I am sorry for it, for Mr. *D*'s sake, and will try if I can help him. The Ministers then were call'd the Portion of God, and said to be his long before Popery, except the Mystery of Iniquity begun to Work in the Days of *Moses*, and he was engag'd to lay the Foundations of the Ecclesiastical Usurpation.

He has said in the Name of God: The *Levites* shall be mine. *My Priests to serve at my Altar*, says Mr. *D.* but not one Word of my Lot, peculiar Portion, or Inheritance. Hear the Context: Behold I have taken the *Levites* from among the Children of *Israel*, instead of all the First-Born, that openeth the Matrix among the Children of *Israel*; therefore, the *Levites* are mine, because all the First-Born are mine: For in the Day that I smote all the First-Born in the Land of *Egypt*, I hallow'd to me all the first Born in *Israel* both Men and Beast; mine they shall be; I am the Lord. Every Thing is God's Portion, the fullness of the Earth, and they that dwell therein; this, notwithstanding *Israel* is his Portion, his People in a distinguish-

ing

ing Manner: But yet, the first Born of them, and all they had is his Portion distinct from the rest. The first Born of the People was peculiarly his: The first Born of the People are redeem'd by the Tribe of *Levi*; therefore the *Levites* were peculiarly God's Portion and Inheritance. He, whom God hath chosen shall come near him. *Mr.* D. *says, here is not one Word of Portion*: Will he deny then, that the chosen of God were his peculiar Portion? *But the Controversy there, was between the* Levites *themselves*. If one Part of the *Levites* was more sacred than another, and peculiar to God's Service; how much more the whole Tribe more sacred and peculiar than the People? Mr. *D.* would have St. *Cyprian* and *Tertullian* particularly cited: If it was not superfluous, I would trouble the Reader with them; at present I think it sufficient to say, they are on my side, and if he durst have deny'd it, I would have produc'd them, He proceeds to observe upon *Clemens Alex.* the Words I insisted upon he has been so kind as to translate: *The Apostle* John *went to the Neighbouring Provinces, in some Places constituting Bishops, in others settling and forming whole Churches, and in others electing some one or other* in the (*a*) *Clergy*, who were signify'd to him by the Spirit. This Reflection follows: *Some were, it seems, by* John *elected into the Clergy*; *therefore the Clergy were God's peculiar Portion*: What is the Clergy? The κλῆρος; Who were elected into it? Some of the Christian People. So then the κλῆρος and the People are distinct. The Clergy are the distinct Portion of God, as Clergy; distinct from the People: Surely if this Man had consider'd the Difference between distinct and exclusive, he could never have wrangled so long. If he takes it that, when we say the Clergy are God's peculiar Portion, we deny that the People are at all his Portion, he disputes without an Adversary; and, if he contends, that in whatsoever Sense the Clergy are God's Portion the People are so too, he distinguishes without a Difference; *for he himself distinguishes between the Clergy and People*.

He comes now to Criticism, and there he always out-does himself. The Word κλῆρος he says, is sometimes us'd for the People (in the New Testament) distinct from the Priest, but no where for the Priest distinct from the People. He produces almost all the Places in the New Testament, in which the Word κλῆρος is us'd. In the first Five it signifies a Lot; these then are impertinent: In the 6, 7, and 8. signifies a Part, share, or Inheritance. These then are of the same Class; in the last his Strength must lie, and yet it is (granting the most) a Place of such Ambignity, that

(*a*) Κλήρω

nothing

nothing, but Courteſy to an old Friend, can make me think of lending it to him. From ſome Texts, which ſpeak nothing to the Purpoſe then, and from one, which ſpeaks he can't tell what, we are taught to conclude, that the *New Teſtament uſes the Word* κλῆροσ *ſometimes* (once with Mr. *D.* is ſometimes, indeed he has ſo little to ſpeak for him, that he ought to make the moſt of every Thing) *for the People diſtinct from the Prieſts, but never for the Prieſts diſtinct from the People.* To honour his learned Pains as much as I can, I will now conſider this poor ſolitary Text, it is thus in the Original: Μηδ' ὡς κατακυριέυοντες τῶν κλήρων. Not as being Lords over God's Heritage, overuling, ſays the Margin. The Learned Verſions differ greatly; *the* Vulgat *Dominantes in cleris*; *the* Syriac, *non tanquam Domini gregis*; *the* Æthiopic, *non negligentes populum ſuum*; *the* Arabic, *non ut qui dominantur conſtitutiis in dignitatibus ſacerdotij.* A Text ſo differently tranſlated, and underſtood, is very fit indeed to ſettle a Controverſy! The Engliſh Verſion he ſeems to build upon, and yet with great Submiſſion it is much the worſt, and none of them come up to the Emphaſis of the Greek. Not as [κατακυριέυοντες] abuſing their Authority over the Heritages [κλήρων] The Original has no ſuch Words as [of God] I preſume then to give this Verſion: Not as abuſing the Authority over the Heritages. The Word tranſlated Heritages is in the plural Number; it may be refer'd to Perſons, or Things. If to Perſons it is much better to reſtrain it to the Colleges of Church Officers, than to extend it to the whole Church. For the whole Church may be call'd God's κλῆρος Heritage, but I believe not his κλῆροι Heritages. But indeed it ſeems much more properly to be refer'd to Things, the *Poſſeſſions* of the Church, Eſtates and Inheritances ſold by the reſpective Poſſeſſors, and depoſited with the Clergy. To the Clergy St. *Peter* writes after this Manner. *My fellow Elders, feed the Flock of Chriſt, which is among you, taking the Overſight thereof, not by Conſtraint, but willingly, not for filthy Lucre, but of a ready well diſpos'd Mind, neither exerciſing greater Authority than you have over the Inheritances, which are intruſted with you to be diſpens'd for the common Subſiſtence; but ſhew your ſelves in this worldly Part of the Care diſintereſted, and ſhine forth bright Examples to the Flock, in an Article which is as often the Occaſion of falling as any. The Reward I would not have you think of in this World. Look up to the chief Shepherd and his Appearance; have an Eye, not to Worldly but Gain, to that Crown of Glory which fadeth not away.*

We have now nothing more to do than to pay our Acknowledgments to Mr. *D.* for guarding againſt popiſh Encroachments, and taking care of the People. Theſe are two Points with which I always find my ſelf ſenſibly affected, and

and can ſcarce forbear Indignation when I obſerve upon the briſk Advances of the Enemy, and the awkward Defence of Friends; it looks as tho' betwixt the Power of thoſe that attack, and the Treachery and Ignorance of thoſe that ſhould repel, we were deſtin'd to ruine. Thus ſome Men would have you believe, that whilſt you are keeping up the common Fences of Chriſtianity, you are favouring the Papiſts; whilſt you are aſſerting the peculiar Relation, which the Clergy have to God, that you are excluding the Laity from any at all, that reveal'd Religion is blinding the Eyes of the People, and all Eccleſiaſtical Government, Tyranny and Oppreſſion; with a great deal more of ſuch ſtale ſtuff, as has been acted over by *Corah* and his Accomplices many hundred Years ago; and has been objected to the Clergy of the eſtabliſh'd Church, till every honeſt Country Fellow ſees through it; the very Authors are aſhamed of it; and every religious prudent Man declares it ſo far from deſerving Confutation, that it is ſunk below ridicule.

Mr. *D.* thanks me for my Civility, in recommending to him Biſhop *Fell*, and Mr. *Dodwel*, but ſeems not to underſtand his Obligation. I did not recommend them upon the general Subject of our Diſpute, but upon the Difference we had about the Word κλῆρος. To return my Civility, he recommends to me Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, and the Biſhop of *Bangor*. Biſhop *Stillingfleet*'s Authority about this Matter is the ſame in all the Writings he owns, as Biſhop *Fell*'s or Mr. *Dodwel*'s. As for the Biſhop of *Bangor*; his Adverſaries have never charg'd him with an heterodox Poſition, but he has deny'd it, and the doubtful Expreſſions of that Author have interpreted the clear ones. Let his Life and Actions be a Comment upon his Writings. Suppoſe him a Biſhop of the Church of *England*, ſworn to believe all her Articles, Canons and Conſtitutions, at leaſt, not Evil; ſworn to obſerve them in the whole Exerciſe of his Office; ſuppoſe him to have enter'd into theſe ſolemn Obligations according to the Senſe of the Impoſer, and to be a Man of Sincerity and Uprightneſs (all but low Suppoſitions in the Character of a Biſhop,) and you'll find Mr. *D.* no great Gainer by this Authority.

Before I releaſe my Reader, I muſt take Notice of Mr. *D*'s Concluſion: *He ſays, my trifling has been the Occaſion of his.* I'm ſorry he ſhould be ſo eaſily led off; but he promiſſes his *Reader no more trouble from himſelf, or me, becauſe I reſolv'd not to anſwer him, unleſs he would write like a honeſt Man and a Scholar.* If I could think it prudent to keep that Reſolution, he would be ſafe enough. There are Men in the World of good Senſe, and great Integrity, who may take Citations for Authorities, and Aſſurance for Argument. It is neceſſary to aſſiſt ſuch in their Enquiries after Truth, and bring

bring the Endeavours of those who oppose it, into dispute by a serious Confutation, rather than bury them in Silence; a Method which Friends may call a generous Contempt; but Enemies will esteem a confess'd Defeat.

If any Person shall think me worthy his Regard, I beg he'll confine himself to the Question, which I have too often repeated before, to mention now. Tho' he should wander I'll not Promise to take no Notice of him; but rather, as long as any one shall oppose the Truth by Cavils, to persist in the Defence of it by detecting them.

I had almost forgot to take off an Imputation Mr. *D.* suggests against me, that I have either contradicted, forgotten, or never read what I subscrib'd, the Articles of the Church. *For tho' I am shy of owning the Church of* Rome, *to be Antichristian, and no true Church, the Articles recommend the Homilies, and the second Part of the Homily for Whitsunday, declares, that the Church of* Rome, *as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred Years and odd, is so far wide from the Nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more.*

I will presume to say no Man hates the Corruptions of *Rome* more than I do; but I can't approve the indiscreet Zeal of some Persons against them: Whatever the partizans of that Cause are in other Respects, they seldom fail to make use of any Advantage, that is given them. They lov'd to be treated with hyperbolical Language, and have the Charge against them oratorically aggravated. They then easily shew, that more is alledg'd than can be prov'd, and appear to be more innocent then they really are, by being said to be more guilty. The Charge in this Homily is against *Rome*, for calling her self *THE true Church*, and engrossing the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to her self, exclusive of all out of her Communion; and the Sense of the Fragment Mr. *D.* is so fond of must be this: No particular Church can have less Pretence to call her self the true Church, than she has. It may be admitted, that she is no more *a true Church*, than, that she is the true Church; but then if she is so far a false, or corrupt Church, as that her Administrations are all invalid, much the greater Part of the reform'd have been in the wrong ever since the Reformation. Not only the Church of *England*, but almost all the Foreign Churches, in their public confessions, have own'd her to be a Church (not as the Word true is oppos'd to corrupt) and their Correspondence with her, ever since she became Schismatical, has monstrously inconsistent and absurd upon any other Principle. To admit her Orders and her Baptisms, is confessing what Mr. *D.* does deny. To charge Schism. *&c.* upon her, is supposing her Relation to the Catholic Church, as a particular Church. I say no more than this: The Church of *England* admits her

Administrations; let it be prov'd then, not from popular Expressions perversly interpreted and argu'd upon, but from Reasons lay'd down in clear proper and determinate Words, that she ought not to do it, and that tho' she does it, they are null.

I make no Excuses for detaining you so long (betwixt me and my Adversary it became unavoidable) nor do I desire you to pardon, what you brought upon your self. Take care that you are assur'd to be well pleas'd with what you ask of me; for I always think my self oblig'd to grant it.

Sir, Yours, F. H.

Sutton, *August* 3rd. 1722.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM 15 FEB 81